

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MARCH, 1850.

VOL. II.—NO. II.

WHAT IS CHURCH HISTORY?

A vindication of the idea of Historical Development. By
PHILIP SCHAF. Translated from the German. Philadelphia:
J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1846. 12 mo. pp. 128.

The subject discussed in this work is full of interest. However widely the views of individuals in regard to History may theoretically differ, its importance is practically admitted by all. It portrays man in all his struggles to solve the questions involved within his own being, and to reach the end of his creation; and contains and truly exhibits the results to which, in the different stages of this process, he has arrived. "It is, and must ever continue to be," consequently, "next to God's word, the richest source of wisdom, and the surest guide to all successful practical activity." Affect, therefore, as some may, to treat history with contempt, and to overrule at the bar of their own judgment, its solemn decisions, whenever convenient to do so, they cannot in reality despise its teachings, nor tear loose from its authority. Those who imagine themselves to be most independent in this

'These remarks find strong corroboration in the fact, that in those theological institutions in which it is considered essential to orthodoxy to deny all real value and authority to Church History, it still is made to occupy a very important place in the course of study.

VOL. II.—NO. II.

respect, are, generally, least so. Not unfrequently they are found seeking the aid of history to sustain them in their protest against history.

It is in its relation to Christianity, however, that History most strongly challenges attention. Church History, in fact, may be said to comprise *all* History. All the great movements of humanity, whether in reference to politics, to literature, to science, or to art, have had a powerful influence upon the Church, and at the same time, were themselves the direct, or indirect results, of the Church's life operating in those several directions. For Christianity is not an isolated principle working itself out to completion, in entire independence of, and indifference to all other spheres of action. It does not achieve its triumphs by a process of sheer demolition, leaving the world unchanged except in a merely outward way. It works as a living principle *in* the world, rather than upon it, destroying only that which is bad, carrying out to its fulfilment all that is good. No proper idea, consequently, can be obtained of any sphere of human activity, except from the stand-point of Christianity. The past, when regarded from any other position, seems to be full of confusion and obscurity,—a chaos of events without order or connection, apparently springing from inadequate causes, and productive of no proper results,—no clue appearing to guide the bewildered inquirer through its dark labyrinths, nor common principle to harmonize its conflicting activities, and bind together its successive periods. As the eddies of a great river to be properly understood, must be viewed in connection with the stream, which sweeps through the main channel, so the changes of society become plain in their origin, and end, only when considered in their relation to Christianity. This must ever necessarily be the case. Christianity is the most important fact in the history of the world,—the attainment, in a living way, of the truth which it embodies, the most important object to which the attention of man has been, or can be directed. Hence it has formed for him, consciously, or unconsciously, in all ages, and nations, the ultimate end of his most earnest strivings; and the deepest movements of the past have sprung from it as their source, or looked to it as their completion.

Nor is it, indeed, possible to arrive at any correct idea of the nature of the Christian religion itself, without a proper regard for its history. Christianity is not an abstract theory, nor yet a mechanical system of law, but a living fact. As such, it can be understood only by contemplating it as it has actually unfolded itself in history, and that too, in the history, not of one age, and

nation, but of all ages, and nations. For it is a world-fact, extending through the world, both as to time, and space. It is only under a general view, therefore, comprehending it in all its manifold relations, and different but consistent forms of action, that the nature of the Christian religion becomes truly and fully manifest. As little as a traveller can determine the course and character of an unexplored stream by the scene which a single point upon its banks presents,—as little as man himself can be understood, if studied with reference only to a single tribe and century,—so little can correct and enlarged views of Christianity be obtained, by confining our attention to the aspect, which it happens to present in some particular period and country.

At all times, then, the study of Church History is important, but it is especially so at present. On the one hand, *Romanism*, declaring itself alone to be the Holy Catholic Church, appeals to the past in vindication of its claims. On the other, Puseyism,—in respect to this point in full harmony with Puritanism,—is striving to lead Protestantism back to the first centuries, leaping over the intervening chasm of fourteen hundred years, and disregarding the mighty results of the Scholastic Philosophy of the Middle Ages, and the Biblical Theology of the Reformation, as entirely without value. Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism (the two latter, at the same time, professedly denying, with glaring inconsistency the authority of History,) with equal earnestness, and apparently with equal confidence of success, search the records of primitive ages, for a perfect portrait of their respective features. To History all parties appeal in corroboration of their claims; and by History their claims must in great measure be decided.

If these remarks are true, the importance of possessing a correct idea of the nature of History must be obvious. For not more certainly will the beauty of a landscape be lost if looked at from an unfavorable point of view, than the truth of History will become distorted, if contemplated from a false position. Its most prominent, and important facts, thrown into the shade, may seem of little consequence or even be completely hid behind the insignificant form of some trivial occurrence improperly thrust into the fore-ground;—its magnificent vistas, resplendent with light when viewed from the proper point, may seem shrouded in darkness; and the influence of Christianity upon the world be made to appear as the blighting shadow of superstition, or the meteoric glare of fanaticism, rather than as the life-giving beams of the Sun of Righteousness. We all know this to be the case. The infidel seeks in the store-house of History for

weapons against the Christian, and uses her assistance in the conflict. The most bigoted advocate of ecclesiastical tyranny,—the most abject upholder of political despotism, on the one hand,—and the most fanatical declaimer in favor of individual lawlessness, on the other, as well as the firm friend of law and liberty, all appeal with equal confidence to History, in justification of their principles, and conduct. And as regarded from their several points of view, she does appear to give each of them her approbation. Yet History in fact, is not thus self-contradictory. The seeming inconsistency results from the want of a proper understanding of what History, in itself considered, is.

The want of a proper idea of History, in this country, is too plainly evident to require proof. In fact, we cannot be said to have any general idea of it, whatever. Every one makes it what he pleases,—forming in this way his own History, and adopting that theory,—if he theorizes at all respecting it,—which best accords with the character of his own mind, or will enable him to defend most successfully preconceived opinions. The truth, that History is but another name for the *World's-life*, gradually unfolding itself, under the guidance of Divine Providence, and consequently that it has an existence of its own, as really as the individual life of man, seems to be comprehended by very few and very often is characterized as Mystical, Rationalistic, or Romanistic, or all together, according to the peculiar prejudices of the individual objector. Most commonly, History is looked upon merely as a collection of facts,—a narrative of events sustaining only an outward relation to each other, as cause and effect, and influencing the world in an incidental way, as the invention of gun-powder, for example, produced a change in the method of carrying on war. We do not wonder that History should be regarded as having no great claims to respect, so long as such notions of its nature are in vogue. Nor is it a matter of surprise to us, that the students of even our oldest and most respectable Theological Seminaries should pursue its study with little interest, when a formal examination upon it is made to consist, possibly of interrogatories respecting the form and furniture of the Churches, and the costume of the clergy in a particular century, or other points of like mechanical concern.

Under such a view, History appears to be the result of mere human action. Its most secret springs are to be found in the caprices and passions of the human heart; and its most important events seem to be but the consequences of the ambition, the selfishness, the weakness, or the generosity, of particular individuals, or communities. "Thus God is thrust out of History,"

and His Providence is virtually denied ; or if He is recognized as the ruler of events, it is only in an outward, mechanical way, presiding over the destinies of nations, and the actions of men, as a player presides over the pieces on a chess-board. It is a fact well worth considering, that most of the English Historians, —all of whom held this view of History, to a greater or less degree,—were infidels ;—and that in Germany,—as Dr. Schaf clearly shows,—the idea ran out into Rationalism as its legitimate result. Nor are we so free from this infidel influence, as is generally imagined. It is easy to see the effect of this false view of History, combined as it always necessarily is with a false view of the Church, upon a large portion of New England Puritanism, carrying it over into so-called “Liberalism,” and thence to infidelity by the closest logical process. Even in that part of the Christian community which is considered really sound, and under the form of the strictest orthodoxy, this tendency is but too apparent ; and it is owing only to the powerful influence of divine truth under other forms, that we do not feel in all their disastrous consequences, the effects of a spirit, to which full assent is yielded in the sphere of History, but which robs History of its truthfulness—distorts the idea of Christianity as actualized in History, perverts the relation of God to the world, and is closely allied to infidelity in all its manifestations. In its least objectionable form, the view of History alluded to does gross injustice to History itself. It throws aside a great portion of the past as entirely valueless. The long lapse of time between the fifth and fifteenth centuries, though full of intense activity, and abounding in vast movements,—being indeed the period when the foundations of our present social structure were laid,—is looked upon as unworthy of notice,—as a vast void in the World’s life, during which God was not in the world at all, in fact, but men were left to grope their way, by themselves, in impenetrable darkness, as best they could.

From all these false results, the theory of History set forth in the book before us is free. God is recognized not only as ruling *over* the world but as actually dwelling in it. He is regarded not as merely watching the course of events, and by occasional interferences causing them to promote His glory, but as being Himself constantly present in History—the original source of its activity, and the controller of all its movements. At the same time, with full consistency, ample room is left for the largest freedom of human will and action. The struggles of man, and the changes of society, do not seem, in this theory, as in the view of History already mentioned, to be a sea of fluctuations in them-

selves without meaning, but the progressive effort of humanity, under the guidance of Divine Providence, to unfold its own nature, and thus to realize the ultimate object of its creation.—No portion of the past is despised, but every part is considered important from its relation to the whole process of History, and as forming one stage of the world's progress.

Thus much for the importance of the subject discussed by Dr. Schaf. Believing that History is not a mere creature of the historian's brain, but has an actual existence of its own, he has endeavored in the work before us to point out its nature and laws. His book is emphatically a "tract for the times,"—an effort to answer questions hitherto unanswered, and little thought of in this country, but demanding a reply as necessary to the solution of the deepest questions of this, or indeed of any age. Impressed with this idea, the author has evidently bestowed upon the subject labor and thought commensurate with its importance and difficulty. His well known learning and mental vigor, and the acknowledged sincerity of his zeal for the truth, were in themselves, a sufficient guarantee for candor and thoroughness in the discussion of the subject. It might reasonably have been supposed, that a work of such character, breaking ground and preparing the way for future culture, in a field so difficult, and yet so rich in fruitful promise, would at once secure serious attention,—that it would be carefully studied,—that not merely isolated parts, but especially its fundamental idea would be critically examined,—and that its errors, if any were found, would be pointed out, and refuted with the same candor, and thoroughness, that characterize the book itself. Surely no other treatment could be anticipated from an earnest theological public.

Such however was not the reception the work met with. It was noticed by two or three of the religious newspapers of the day,—was harshly denounced, in one instance, without having been read through; and in the only instance in which, so far as we remember, it was formally reviewed, its fundamental principle was left untouched. This, we believe to be a fair example of the mode in which views that do not fully accord with the reigning tone of thought, both as to form and substance, are disposed of. The most approved method of escaping from them, seems to be, without the formality of a trial, either dictatorially to denounce them, or to consign them to oblivion by silent contempt. Quite a number of works upon important subjects, some of them very able, have lately met with this summary treatment. The method is certainly very effectual to prevent disturbance in established opinions, but most unfavorable to the progress of truth.

Though the effort of Dr. Schaf to direct attention to the nature and laws of Church History has apparently failed, we do not think that it has done so, in reality. Very probably it is better for the final success of the book, that it did not at once secure general notice. Had it done so, it doubtless would soon have been dismissed from attention, without having been permitted to produce much effect. As it is, many earnest minds have been quietly reflecting upon it; and the thought and discussion produced by kindred topics, meanwhile submitted to public consideration from different quarters, have prepared the way for a juster appreciation and a clearer apprehension of the whole subject. It is under this conviction, and with the hope of turning attention to the book, rather than of throwing light upon a subject treated in its pages with far more clearness than we have power to do, that we pen this article. In pursuance of our design, we shall employ the remaining space allowed us in exhibiting as well as we can by extracts from the work, its general plan and character.¹

Before entering upon the discussion of the true idea of Church History the author takes a comprehensive survey of the recent results of German labor in that direction. This survey is prefaced with some interesting remarks upon the general character of German Theology, and its probable influence upon the world, which we cannot forbear quoting, in part:

"In all the deeper movements of the world of mind, Germany for three hundred years past, has led the way for other nations. She is the land that gave birth to those world-embracing ideas which introduced the Protestant period of the Church, and have wrought such mighty changes in State, Science and art, and the entire social life of the modern world. In the Reformation she set in motion the entire course of Protestant History as it has developed itself from that time to the present. But as Rome was twice the centre of the world's life, while the sword of the capitol, transplanted with broken point to the dome of St. Peter, ruled the world for a full thousand years; so Germany would appear to be called to act the second time a world-historical part in the fact that the spirit of the Reformation resuscitated under a new form is just at this time, actively engaged on all sides with the work of a vast revolution whose power may be

¹ To some, who have a copy of Dr. Schaf's work, it may seem unnecessary to quote as largely, as we intend doing. It should be remembered, however, that in all probability the book has never been seen, by very many readers of the "*Mercersburg Review*;" and the most effectual way of introducing it to their notice, we believe, will be to furnish copious extracts, together with a synopsis of its main chapter.

expected, in the end, to rule the life of the world for whole centuries to come."

"No reference is here had to the so-called German Catholic movement, which the Protestant religious press of this country, with a most marvellous want of critical discernment, has already trumpeted as a second Reformation. * * * We have in our eye rather the exploits as they may be styled, of the *later Protestant Theology*, of Germany. These must make their way in time over the whole cultivated world, and exert a mighty influence on the form and shape that shall be given hereafter to Church relations. Those who measure the importance of all things by their immediately outward consequences, and in whose view nothing is counted eventful but what fills the general popular consciousness with its sound, will be ready, no doubt, to smile at this declaration. Such, however, would do well to consider how they are to get along with Christianity itself, which was present in history as the great regenerating principle of dying humanity, working silently but powerfully like leaven, long before the central power of the world as it then stood, so much as thought of bestowing upon it the least notice." * * * *

"No one who is thoroughly acquainted with the extended exegetical, critical and historical inquiries, as well with the philosophical and dogmatic struggles of the last 20 or 30 years," in Germany, ("reaching as they do to the inmost ground of all things") can possibly yield to the discouraging thought, that such an extraordinary mass of acuteness, intellect and learning should have been all to no purpose and that the sore spiritual toil of the most gifted and excellent men of the age should have been absolutely thrown away. It is true that the German theology, in the last century, became more estranged from its proper life-element of religion and the Church, than was the case in other lands. Whilst the Deism of England, and the Naturalism of France, failed to rise in general above the lowest and most shallow popular free-thinking, the unbelief, of Germany formed itself into a scientific system, fortified with a fearful bulwark of learning and philosophy, which became thus immensely more difficult to overcome than in any other case. The German takes so deep an interest in science and religion as such, and is possessed at the same time of such inexhaustible energy and perseverance of mind, that this character proclaims itself even under a false, perverse tendency, and he cannot rest till he has pushed a principle out to its most extreme consequences. But for this very reason again, he alone could produce a *scientific* remedy for the disease in question. A large shadow indicates always the presence of a large body. The process could not stop, of course, content with rationalism. For the Church of God must bid defiance even to the gates of hell. There arose accordingly with the beginning of the present century, and more particularly since the Jubilee of the Reformation, celebrated in the year 1817, in connexion with the false theology of Rationalism, in

its different forms, still retaining some portion of its old life, a powerful reaction, which with the keen weapons of the latest scientific cultivation and the force of a newly resuscitated religious feeling, carried breach after breach into the system of unbelief, and began once more to build up again the ancient faith with the most diligent zeal. This, however, is not a direct unconditioned return to the earlier stand-point of Church theology, over against which rationalism must be allowed to have a certain kind of right; but a living reproduction rather, and for this very reason, at the same time an advance. The pure negation of a particular tendency, is never a victory over it. Only such an opposition can be so considered, which recognizes also and saves the element of truth in which the tendency has its life.—pp. 11-14.

It would be gratifying to follow the author still farther, into this part of his book, but the limits of our article will not permit us. We commend the whole chapter, however, to the attention of all who desire to know, what has been done, of late, for TRUTH in Germany, and especially to those who imagine German theology to be throughout unsound. No one can rise from the perusal of this portion of the book without a higher regard for German Literature, and a strong conviction that it must, in the necessity of the case, exert a powerful influence upon the world of thought, for a long time to come, together with a feeling of surprise, that in this country, we should have so long neglected to avail ourselves of the rich stores of knowledge, heaped up and systematized by German labor and offered to us on the slight condition of a reproduction in an English form.

The most important section of the work, is that which unfolds the author's idea of Church History. This we will endeavor to exhibit, as far as we can, in the words of the book. But inasmuch as we shall frequently be obliged, for the sake of brevity, to join detached sentences, and parts of sentences, by clauses of our own, we will place quotation marks only where we give the author's language unaltered and at some length. After some interesting preliminary remarks upon the nature of the Church, Dr. Schaf proceeds to consider first the nature of History in general, and afterwards of *Church History*:

"HISTORY denotes in its objective sense the general course of events; subjectively the representation of these events. This definition, however, requires to be made more particular, so soon as History comes to be handled as a science. Only that can be called *Historical*, strictly speaking, which has exercised a determining influence upon the progress of humanity. * * * As every individual has his history, so has humanity as a whole. Its biography

is universal or World History. Revelation and enlightened reason teach us, to look upon the human race as a single family, which has sprung from one and the same common ancestor, and tends toward the same end, the exhibition of God's glory. Hence the History of the world also must be conducted as a living organism, in which the irresistible onward movement of humanity towards its end,—may be fairly represented. The Histories of particular nations form the members of this organic body ; through which, under all difference of character, and calling, and position, and circumstances, one life-blood still flows, and in which the idea of humanity, as formed from God, and for God, dwells as a single soul. All nations, however, are not Historical, any more than all individuals ; but only such as have made themselves felt in a living way upon the actual developments inward and outward, of the world's life as a whole." * * * * *

"As nations which have come to free action, and individuals that reciprocally complete one another, form thus the factors of world-history, so we are to recognize in different periods the several stadia, inwardly connected, and flowing necessarily one out of another, through which the idea of humanity must proceed, in order to come always to a more complete realization and exhibition of its own nature. Every period has a distinct character, which is impressed more or less on all its movements and tendencies. This is denominated the spirit of the age. It is nothing more than the world-spirit, or the spirit of humanity itself at a particular point of its age. For humanity, like the single man of which it is organically composed, passes through the stages of childhood, earlier and later youth, and manhood, onward to old age." * * * * *

"At the same time, every period and every people has also its several stages of life through which to pass ; and then we must say again that Christianity, as such, includes a new course of development, peculiar to itself, and essentially different from all that went before. Religion in this form is not to be viewed as an advance simply upon the Jewish system, exalting it to a higher state. It must be regarded rather as a new creation, by which a new principle, a divine life is communicated to humanity itself. Christianity forms the turning point of the world's History ; and Christ the true pole star of the whole, is the centre also around which all revolves ; the key, as the great historian John Von Müller expressed himself, which alone can unlock the sense of all that has taken place before his advent, or since. In Christ, the ideal of humanity has been actualized. All history before him must be viewed as a preparation for his presence ; a preparation, which in Judaism carried a positive character, in the way of progressive revelations and condescensions on the part of God ; while in Paganism it was more negative, a helpless struggle upwards on the part of man. All history since Christ finds its central movement in the divine principle

of life, which he has introduced into human nature, and which is destined gradually to take all up into its own element as revealed in his person. In this view it becomes *Church History*."—pp. 37-41, *passim*.—

CHURCH HISTORY.

CHURCH HISTORY itself like every other theological discipline, has its own history; having reached the high position it now occupies by degrees. We distinguish, in its course of development, three periods. The first two stand related to each other as extremes. By surmounting both, and at the same time recognizing the truth contained in both, that higher view has come to prevail which enters clearly into the ground of all the more important modern German historical works.

I. *The Orthodox Historiography.*

Chronicles and annals constitute, down to the time of the Reformation almost the only attempts at Church History; very valuable of course as collections of material, but still no more than attempts at History. Church History, as a science commences, where the Church comes to reflect upon herself; where the historian so represents his matter as to put life into it spiritually from some point of view. The first stand-point which presents itself in the development of the idea of Church History, is that of the earlier *orthodoxy* as well Roman Catholic, as Protestant. "We may style it the stand-point of *established orthodoxy*, and *exclusive ecclesiasticism*. It consists in general, in this, that the Church, with her whole system of doctrine and life, is regarded as something complete from the start; and is thus made to stand, under some received visible form in abstract opposition to all diverging sects, as the absolute and only legitimate representative of the Christian faith. Outward changes in the fortunes of the Church, by its growth in the way of missionary activity, and aggression upon the world are of course admitted, but all idea of an *inward* development of the *nature* of the Church itself, is rejected." This view of the Church and its history was held both by the Roman Catholic and early Protestant historians, though differently applied in practice.

"*Historical method of the Older Protestant Orthodoxy:*" Under this view of History, "the conception of the Church be-

came more broad and spiritual.¹ It was no longer identified with the communion of Rome. Elements of evangelical truth and Christian life were recognized in the sects also of the Middle Ages. It was generally admitted that the Lord had at all times reserved a people for himself, even under the dominion of the Pope; but what might be called *Roman* properly in the Catholic Church, the papacy with its institutions, was regarded as an apostacy from the true Church." After the Reformation the Roman Church, in this theory, took the character of a heresy, and Protestantism took the place that was previously occupied by Rome.

Notwithstanding this change, however, the church continued to be for Protestant historians as well as Roman, something complete in its nature from the beginning, not needing nor admitting any proper development. All activity in the sphere of doctrine, was apprehended only under the form of a vindication or denial of the truth; so that the history of doctrines resolved itself at the last into a mere history of heresies. The entire Protestant system was supposed to be found immediately and literally in the Bible, even in the Old Testament itself, and in the life and practice of the first period of the Church; so that the whole intermediate history was made to sink in fact into the character of an unmeaning and useless episode. As it regards government and worship, the more liberal acknowledged changes even within the true Church, but then they looked upon these as the accidental rise and disappearance merely of indifferent ceremonies. At the same time, there were not wanting those who imagined that they could find a specific system of Church government and form of worship, complete in all its details, in the New Testament.² The view taken of the relation between the reigning Church, and dissenting bodies, remained formally the same that it had been before in the Roman Catholic conception of history; namely that of exclusive ecclesiasticism.

Here, however, this principle fell into a striking self-contradiction in its application. In the first period of the Church, on into the sixth century, the Protestant view went hand in hand with the Romanist in acknowledging the authority of the œcumenical councils, and opposing the sects. But the case changed in the Middle Ages. Here the Protestant Historians were

¹ We pass by the author's exposition of the Roman Catholic view of history, from want of space.

² Such persons are still to be found.

forced to take sides with the non-catholic sects, and to make *them* to be the true Catholic Church, in order to maintain some show of consistency with their previous rule of judgment. But this was attended with great difficulties. For in the first place the Middle Ages are only the regular development of the Catholic Church of the first six centuries. All the germs even of the papacy existed thus early. A second difficulty appears in the fact, that a large proportion of the sects which existed before the Reformation, were further removed in a number of points from the Protestant orthodoxy, than the errors even of the Church of Rome itself. Finally, such Protestants as had carried their studies somewhat thoroughly into the Catholic theology of the Middle Ages could not with all their respect for the dissenting sects, shut their eyes to the fact, that at least as much piety as they could exhibit, and a great deal more learning also had place in the reigning Church. This was especially evident in the persons of such men as *Anselm of Canterbury*, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Thomas a Kempis*. Thus through the pressure of the difficulties which have been mentioned, as well as by the continued development of orthodox theology itself, there was gradually formed during the 18th century, a *mediating* view, or *moderate* orthodoxy. This is the *supranaturalistic* style of *Church History*. The term *supranaturalism* is employed in the historical sense of the word to designate the last representatives of the old Protestant orthodoxy, as opposed to Pietism, and still more to Rationalism, by which the theology of Germany was overpowered during the last century. The *supranaturalistic* historians agree with their strict orthodox predecessors in this: that they look upon the process of history simply as a series of favorable or unfavorable events; and the exhibition of it is considered to be not a living reproduction, but a simple narration, merely of these events. The Christian doctrines are viewed as a fixed unalterable system, handed down through the Bible, and existing in the same form from the beginning. On the other hand, the *supranaturalistic* historians differed from the strictly orthodox, in regarding deviations from the Church theology with more indulgence. They did not look upon heresies as the product of bad intention; but rather as errors of thought or imagination, or as deviations merely from Church terminology, thus reducing often the most weighty doctrinal controversies to unmeaning logomachies. Lastly, they even justified the heretics in part against the orthodox. In this, however, they assailed their own assumption, that heresy must be regarded as sheer falsehood, which of course can never have

any right in opposition to divine truth. To close the eyes then indulgently in favor of falsehood, could not fail to promote a spirit of indifference to truth and error, of a very dangerous character. This did, in fact, towards the close of the century become generally prevalent; so that it became an easy thing for Rationalism to conquer so poor an enemy, and even to bring it over to its own side.

II. *The Rationalistic Historiography.*

The second stand-point of ecclesiastical history may be styled, in opposition to that of the old orthodoxy, the stand-point of *fluctuating heterodoxy*, and *unchurchly subjectivity*. This, also has its own historic process, in which we may distinguish two periods: the *Pietistic* and the proper *Rationalistic*. The two differ widely in their views; but both come together in the point of unchurchliness, and this explains the transition of the first over into the last, as its proper theoretic consequence.

The Pietistic Method of History, or that of sectarian religious separation. The Pietistic method resembled the Supra-naturalistic in its indifference in regard to true and false doctrine. It made very little account of theology. Its concern was all for practical religion. In the sphere of history, this form of thinking would, of course, try the worth of every person and church by the standard of subjective piety; and as this, in many cases, seemed to prevail among the oppressed sects, rather than in the reigning Church, all *religious life*, and so of course all true *historical legitimacy* also, was attributed to the former. This we find exemplified in the History of the learned and pious *Gottfried Arnold*, who belongs properly to this Pietistic school.

The Rationalistic Method of History: It is easy to see that the Pietistic view of history, could not fail to shake the credit of the reigning Church, in favor of the dissenting sects; nay to bring its very existence into question. It required only the loss of that religious feeling which Pietism inherited from the Church, in order to fall over necessarily into Rationalism. This took place in the person of *Semler*. *Semler*, in common with *Arnold*, had a strong feeling against the ruling Church, and in favor of all uncatholic dissenters. To this was joined, however another important element, which had no place with *Arnold* whatever; namely the comprehension of the material of ecclesiastical history, and indeed of orthodoxy itself under the view of endless mutability; which we must take care however not to

confound with the conception of organic development. He believed that doctrines were always in a course of change; and that the church system as it stood in his own time, was not something which had existed constantly, under the same form, from the first, but was rather the result of a continually advancing disfiguration of what might be regarded as the original biblical form of Christianity. This view of Semler served to inflict on the old orthodoxy and its theory of history a second stroke, that proved indeed to be deadly. For this whole school based itself on the assumption, that whatever might have arisen in time could not be properly of divine or eternal right.

The followers of Semler could, of course consistently with their principles, find no more important work than that of demolishing the Church and its history down to the time of the Apostles. "The vast labour of centuries was looked upon as labour spent in vain. The acute dogmatical distinctions of the œcumenical councils were thrust aside as sophistical subtelties. The symbolical books of the Protestant Church were condemned as dishonorable shackles for the human mind; the deep speculations of the most spiritual thinkers derided as empty dreams; the vigorous manifestations of faith in opposition to unbelief, cried down as wild Zealotism; the greatest enterprises of the Church, in other times, or among other people, branded as the product of dark religious fanaticism."

To give some account, at the same time, of the past activity of the world, the *pragmatical* method was adopted. Mosheim had already laid down the rule that Church History must be pragmatic; that is, must not simply relate events, but as he expresses it, "unfold also, under the guidance of psychology, the causes to which they are to be referred in the passions, tricks and windings of the human heart. This pragmatism was not so dangerous with Mosheim, and his school, on account of their connexion with the Church orthodoxy; but in the hands of religious indifferentism and rationalism, it turned the entire history of the Church, into a purely subjective play of human passions. The most important doctrines and events, all tried by the standard of the most miserable private judgment, were deduced from idle speculation, or the lowest motives of a selfish heart; the divinity of Christ, for instance, from the rhetorical fancy of Athanasius; the doctrine of free grace and original sin, from Augustine's stiff humor, and fondness for writing; the papacy of the Middle Ages, from the imposition of the false Isodorian decretals and the ambition of "the rascal" Hildebrand; the Reformation from the pecuniary embarrassment of Leo X; the

Lutheran dogma of the Lord's Supper from the stupid obstinacy and contentious spirit of Luther himself.

"Thus was God excluded from History altogether; which was at the same time, to thrust out its eyes, and tear the living heart from its bosom. The life-course of the Redeemer's bride, was caricatured into a "History of human folly." The theatre of God's kingdom in the world was degraded into a wild arena of base, unholy passions."

Having thus traced the idea of History throughout its several stages, until it reached the position just above described, Dr. Schaf points out the successive steps by which a juster method of History, reproducing within itself in a living way, and in a higher form, the truth of the previous methods, but rejecting their errors, has at length been reached. We are unable, from want of space, to follow him in his sketch. We commend it, however, (as containing convincing evidence of the ridiculousness of their opinion) to those who imagine German Philosophy and Theology to be a mere chaos of wild and unmeaning speculation, controlled by no certain principles, having no definite ends in view, and producing no consequences of practical value to the progress of truth. Sure we are that no one can seriously contemplate the idea of Church History passing in the process of its development, through so many different philosophic schools, and conflicting forms of thought, without perceiving,—what the constitution of mind itself should have led him from the first to believe,—that severe mental and spiritual struggles must always have their ground in the mental and spiritual wants of our nature, and can never be carried on without producing some valuable practical result.

In accordance with the design of our article we pass on immediately to give a condensed exhibition of the author's own view of Church History. This is substantially the same with that which in its general idea enters as a controlling element into all the more important modern German historical works, though differently held by different persons, from whom Dr. Schaf also claims the right to deviate, in regard to some points. The view alluded to forms:

III. *The Modern Historiography, or the stand-point of Organic Development.*

"The orthodox treatment of history, as well as the rationalistic, came to a dissolution by the irresistible process of their own development, under the one-sided tendency which belonged to each."

Out of their ruins, the elements of truth, which both possessed, divested of their perishable hull, became united in a higher method, in which they now came to their true force. "We allow both the previous methods, then, up to a certain point, and incorporate them so far into our own view."

"The *orthodox* theory of history we hold to be right in two essential points. First in insisting upon something unchangeable in history. But while the theory identifies this at once with the *church doctrine*, and affirms that *this* has undergone neither decrease nor increase, but perversions and obscurations only; we, on the other hand, distinguish between truth as objectively present in Christ and in the Scriptures, and truth as subjectively present in the consciousness of the Church, and say: Christianity in itself considered is complete in Christ, in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and who is the same yesterday, to day, and forever; and also in his word, which is exhibited in the holy Scriptures of the New Testament in a pure, original, perfect, and absolutely normative form, for all times. Subjective Christianity, on the contrary, or the life of the God-man in his Church is a process, a development, which begins small, and grows larger, till it comes at last to full manhood in Christ; that is till the believing human world may have appropriated to itself, both outwardly and inwardly, the entire fulness of objective Christianity, or the life of Christ. In this view the word of God was not at once understood by the Church from the beginning, in all its depth and comprehension, but gradually always more and more with the advancing age of the Church." * * * "We agree with the orthodox stand-point, in the second place, in believing the *Church* to be the bearer of God's truth, and of Christian life, the lawful and proper heir of all the promises of the Gospel. But we do not, for this reason, agree with it, in denying the sects all right to exist, and excluding them from all participation in the truth. On the contrary, we suppose them to play an indispensable part, in modifying and determining the development of the orthodox Church itself."

We consider the *rationalistic* theory of history "right, in this respect generally, in the first place, that it apprehends the life and doctrine of the Church as something movable and flowing. But in determining more particularly the nature and character of this movement, we differ from it essentially. The rationalist sees in the movement only the lawless play of caprice, without any unity at the ground of the manifold, without any fixed and definite end, resolving all mainly into the course of mere human affections and passions. * * * But we conceive of historical movement, as an ever-increasing stream, whose course has been already prescribed in the plan of eternal wisdom, and

VOL. II.—NO. II. 9*

which now rolls itself forward according to divine law, to empty itself finally in the ocean of eternity. We maintain, consequently, that the Spirit of Christ himself, uninterruptedly present in the Church, is the chief factor in history, to whose power all human factors, which are also to be acknowledged in their place, must be regarded as subordinate; and that nothing which has once come to be of true historical weight can be absolutely negated, or made to become null, but must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element into the subsequent part of the process."

* * * * *

It remains now for us in the first place, to explain the idea of *organic* or *regular development*, since this forms the key to the proper understanding of our theory; and in the second place, to show how the idea is to be applied to the history of the Church. "Only that which is dead has the privilege of being *done*. All, on the other hand, that can lay claim to life, is in its inmost nature a genesis, movement, process, development. * * * The proper *genesis* first appears in the sphere of organic nature, in the life of the *plant*. The plant is possessed of a real life, and is the subject thus of a development that begins with the seed, forms itself from this into the root, stem, branch, leaf, and blossom, and becomes complete in its fruit. Here we have progress constantly from the lower to the higher; but still nothing is revealed that was not contained potentially at first in the germ. * * * A still higher form of life is the animal; at the head of which (though of a specifically different order of existence) stands man, so far as his earthly nature is concerned. Man, * * * after his birth makes the course of childhood, boyhood, youth, manhood, and old age. In all these stages he is *man*, and preserves thus in his development the unity of his nature; but in all, at the same time, he is also different, inasmuch as his general nature takes continually a more definite form, and reveals itself in a higher and more perfect way. Still even the highest stage, the life of the old man, is but the full evolution of the life that was originally present in the child. This development we denominate regular and organic; since it follows with necessity an inward life-force, proceeds with equal, steady order, and continues always true to the original nature of the man, till in the end it has brought the whole fulness of it into view. The German language, which is uncommonly rich and philosophical, has an admirable word, that expresses all that is comprised in this idea of organic development. It is the word *aufheben*, which is so much used, and we may say so much *abused* also, in the Hegelian philosophy. It includes three meanings, namely, to

abolish (tollere) to *preserve* (conservare) and to *raise* to a higher state (elevare). All these senses are wonderfully combined, in the idea with which we are now concerned. We may say with the fullest truth, of man, that in every higher stage of his existence, his previous life is in this threefold view *aufgehoben*. The child is abolished as a child in the young man, and yet is preserved, at the same time, and raised unto a higher stage of life. The temporary outward form is abolished; the substance, the idea is preserved; not however by continuing to be what it was before, but by mounting upwards to a more exalted mode of outward existence."

"Parallel precisely with the bodily life of man in this view, is the life also of his spirit. For soul and body are by divine constitution most intimately joined together, and what God has thus joined, man has no right to put asunder. Both parts of his being develop themselves, hand in hand together. Man comes not into the world a scholar, an artist, or the possessor of a fully formed moral and religious character. He carries within him, indeed, the *capacity* for life, in such form; but only in the way of *germ*, that must yet be developed, by impulse from within, and the influence of proper conditions from without, as the plant grows through the action of air, sunshine, and rain. Here also, we have in full again, what we have just noticed in the case of his animal life. Spiritual growth or development is likewise a process of annihilation, preservation, and exaltation; in which it comes in the end to a complete explication only, of what was present by implication at the start. This must be affirmed even of the development of the life of religion itself. Its commencement is the new birth; its end the resurrection of the body. This last is only the full consummation of the first, its proper ultimate consequence, by which the new spirit has added to it the new body also, as its needful organ and blessed habitation." * * * * *

"What holds of the individual must hold also of humanity as a whole, since this is simply the organic totality of all single men. So precisely as the single Christian does not become complete at a stroke, but only by degrees, the Church, as the complex of all Christians, must admit, and require too a gradual development. Christ himself, the head of the Church, submitted to the law of a genesis in time, and grew from infancy up to manhood. This genesis was no opposition merely, no *δόξεις*, as many of the Gnostics supposed; but truth and reality. "Jesus *increased*," it is written, "in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man," (Luke ii. 52). "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience, by the things which he suffered," (Heb. v. 8). How then shall the Church, which repeats and continues the earthly human life of

Christ, form an exception to this law of development. The Lord himself teaches the contrary, in the parables he employs to represent the nature of the kingdom of God; comparing it with the small mustard seed that gradually becomes a great tree, (Matt. xiii. 31, 32;) and with leaven, that works and spreads till the whole lump is leavened (v. 33). Paul is full of the idea of a constantly advancing development on the part of the Church. He speaks of the whole building of the saints, as *growing* to a holy temple in the Lord, (Eph. ii. 21., Comp. 1 Peter ii. 5). He dwells on the *edifying* of the body of Christ, until we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, (Eph. iv. 12, 13., Comp. v. 16., also iii. 18, 19, and Col. ii. 19)."

"We present, now, the particular characteristics of this development of the kingdom of God, as they disclose themselves in a thorough study of history."

I. "The development of the Church is partly *external*, and partly *internal*. The first consists in the progressive diffusion of the gospel among those who are not Christians, by the activity of missions. This must go forward as long as there may be a soul that has not yet heard of Christ crucified. * * * * * As soon as Christianity has gained footing among a people, however a more difficult *interior* mission begins; having for its object the transfusion of the manners and institutions of such a people with the Christian principle. This forms that *inward* development, which we have here chiefly in view. * * * Like leaven the Gospel must work itself into the universal mass of life, under all its established forms." Hence the Church exerts a powerful influence upon Government, Art and Science, greatly modifying their outward form, and transfusing them inwardly by her own spirit. Thus too the Church, "transforms the *natural social life* of the nations, and causes her faith to show itself in a system of virtues and good works, which as Christian all rest on the principle of love to God."

II. "The development is *organic*. It is no mechanical accumulation of events, and no result simply of foreign influences. Certain outward conditions are indeed required for it as the plant needs air, moisture, and light, in order to grow. But still the impelling force in the process, is the inmost life of the Church herself. Christianity is a new creation that unfolds itself continually more and more from within, and extends itself by the necessity of its own nature. It takes up, it is true, foreign material also in the process; but changes it at once into its own spirit, and assimilates it to its own nature, as the body converts the food, required for its growth into flesh and blood, marrow and bone. The Church accordingly, in this development, remains true always to her own nature, and reveals only what it contained in embryo, from the start. Through all changes—first Greek, then Roman Catholic, then German Evan-

gelical *—she never ceases still to be the Church. So the oak also changes, but can never become an apple tree. Just because the Church does unfold itself from within, as now affirmed, obeying its own life-law throughout, the process itself must form a whole, in which the several parts mutually complete each other. It is only the entire history of the Church, from her commencement in the congregation at Jerusalem to her consummation in the general judgment, which can fully represent her conception." * * * *

III. "The development in question includes the three-fold form of action, which has been already described as expressed by the German word *aufheben*. Each new stage negates the preceeding one, by raising its inmost being to a more adequate form of existence. Annihilation is thus required. * * * * But it is only the outward, the transient, that is thus annihilated. The substance abides." * * * * *

IV. "The development of the Church is carried forward, by means of *dialectic opposites* and *extremes*. This is a very weighty point, which is indispensable to a right understanding of Church History. Here the history of mankind shows itself different from the history of the divine Redeemer. His life unfolded itself quietly, like a clear stream flowing with smooth regularity in a straight course. * * He suffered indeed and died; but this came not properly from the constitution of his own nature morally considered; it grew out of his voluntary assumption of the place of men, in order to redeem them from the power of sin. His own life, as such, remained always calm and serenely clear, in uninterrupted communion with his heavenly Father. This was because he knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. If Adam had not fallen, his life would have unfolded itself in his posterity, in the same way, without being required either to pass through death, that sharpest and hardest of all contradictions. He fell, however, and the human nature along with him, including of course the whole human race; as partaking of the same life. Hence, in history, all errors, contradictions, conflicts and sufferings, with death at their head. Christ has appeared indeed as the second Adam, and introduced into humanity a new principle of life, that must in the end triumph over all contradictions, all sin and all evil. But this principle can realize itself only in a gradual way. The Church on earth consists not of perfect saints, but of dying sinners, comprehended in a process of sanctification, which will end only with the outward resurrection. Freedom from sin and error may be predicated of Christ and the Church triumphant, but not of the Church militant. So long, accordingly, as the elements of a still unrenewed life continue to work in her constitution, her development must necessarily involve hard struggles and conflicts." * * * Thus, up to the time of the Reformation, the "history of Christianity had been a development of the principle of objectivity, authority, obe-

dience, Jewish Christian legalism. This was carried so far that the power of the Church became at last an insupportable bondage. Then the spirit of personal freedom, trained by such discipline to ripe self-possession rose in revolt. With this begins the evolution of the principle of subjectivity, the Gentile Christian element, evangelical liberty and independence." Evangelical freedom, however, has degenerated into fleshly self-will, and licentiousness. Hence the historical stream of Christianity, is now turning from this pseudo-protestant extreme, towards a higher form of true Church life in the opposite direction. "Not only on this large scale, however, is the law in question illustrated; it repeats itself also, in each single period, within more narrow compass. Every where one extreme begets another." * * * Thus, for example, "the formality of the English Episcopal Church causes Puritanism to appear; and when this swings over to the opposite extreme, a reaction follows in the restoration of the Stuarts." * * * *

V. "The truth, in this whole case lies not in the extremes, but in the middle, or the *deep* rather, in which they may be said to meet! The very nature of an extreme is, that it pushes one side of a truth into pre-eminence at the cost of another; wronging thus the interest itself which it seeks to uphold, since the organic nature of truth makes it impossible for any part of it to be fairly represented, without due regard at the same time to other parts." * * * "This right middle, is removed heaven-wide from a characterless halting between two opinions, or that loose eclecticism, which throws heterogeneous elements together, and then dignifies the undigested mish-mash with the name of a system. Such a middle must be pronounced rather something worse than the extremes it seeks to avoid; since it lacks courage and energy to attach itself decidedly either to the one, or the other."

VI. "Every stage of development has its own corresponding *disease*. That the process should pass through diseases, might be presumed even from the analogy of our natural existence; it results with necessity from the elements of sin and error, that still cleave to the Church in her militant state, as well as from her connexion with the unregenerate world whose influence she is made continually to feel. These diseases form the Antichristian power in the Church, which first has also a development of its own. Along with the wheat grow the tares till the last judgment." * * * *

VII. "These diseases, however, attending the development of the Church, prove in the hand of an all-wise God, who in the end rules all for His own glory, the *negative conditions*, of her *progress*. * * * With the consciousness of disease, awakes also the desire for improvement. * * * When the Church is brought to thorough repentance for her sin, and the proper means are employed, her original life returns more fresh, and vigorous than ever before; as

the natural body, after having surmounted the diseases of early life, goes on to unfold itself subsequently with increased strength."

VIII. "The starting points of new stages of development, or the epochs that unfo'd themselves into periods, carry, according to the want of the time, the character prevailing, either of *restoration*, or *revolution*, or *reformation*; of which three forms of change the last must be considered the highest and most influential. By *restoration*, we understand the simple re-establishment of a state which has existed before, without any advance. * * * * Revolution is the unsparing violent overthrow of what is at hand. * * * * In the midst between restoration and revolution, stands *reformation*; the improvement and productive advancement of what is at hand; or such an overthrow of the old, as is its fulfilment, by raising its truth to a higher position. A reformation includes in itself both restorational and revolutionary elements, and the organic union of these, through the force of a positive life-principle, is that precisely which constitutes its peculiarity." * * * * *

IX. "Reformatory movements are characterized by having at their head *great religious personalities*, which have become filled and ruled, in mind and heart, by the power of a deep religious idea."

X. "The main stream of development, though full of turns, moves always *forwards*. We say purposely the *main stream*, which was formed first by the Greek-Roman universal church; then by the Romano-Germanic Catholicism; and since the Reformation appears in evangelical Protestantism. Along with this there are side-currents that may dry away entirely. Thus we find sects which having fulfilled their historical call, without uniting themselves afterwards with the general life of the Church, are as it were turned into stone. * * Large Churches also, that once formed the main stream of history, may sunder themselves from the historical movement, and then stagnate and waste away in dead formalism. This is the case with the Greek Church since its separation from the West, and with those sections of the Roman Church, since the Reformation, that stand in no connexion whatever with Protestantism. With this restriction we affirm an uninterrupted progress in the history of the Church. As soon as we are set free from the cheerless view, that takes history to be the product of mere human activity, without the living intervention of the almighty love and wisdom of God himself, we must necessarily come to this idea of a progressive movement. * * * God has proposed for his kingdom upon earth, a definite end. * * * It would imply either that He is not almighty, or that He deals not seriously with men, to suppose that the Church is not always in fact coming to this end, or that it is never to be reached." * * * * *

"The Rationalists also talk much of an ever-advancing "aufklärung of humanity, in their sense." But they mean by this an advance *beyond* Christ and the Bible. Every such conception

we decidedly reject ; and affirm, that this would be no advance, but a relapse only to Paganism and Judaism. According to our view, on the contrary, Christ is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end ; and all true progress, as we have before remarked, consists simply, in a more full appropriation continually of his divine human life, and a deeper understanding of his word, which is the absolute truth, and eternal life itself." * * * * *

"Particular periods, however, may be held up to our view, that seem wholly at variance with our affirmation" of continued progress; "periods in which religious life has almost entirely failed, and dark superstition, or daring unbelief, or both perhaps together, have reigned supreme in the Church. * * * * But here we refer to our previous exposition, in which we have shown that the development before us, is carried forward through diseases, that cause the vital energy to give way at times, for a season ; only however that it may afterwards, as soon as the disease has been overcome display itself again, more actively than before." * * * *

XI. "The last feature of the development of the Church, which we shall mention, is found in its *Geographical* course. This proceeds in general, like that of the Sun, from *East to West*. The cradle of Christianity as also of History and civilization generally, is in the orient. Even in the time of the Apostles, it passed over from Palestine to Asia Minor, Greece and Italy." Thence in the lapse of centuries it has advanced westward, until now it finds its home in Germany, England, and the United States of America. "From this country again, perhaps, when its civilization shall reach Oregon, may proceed principally the evangelization of China and India, still bearing the gospel westward in its sun-like course ; till it finally shall return, with the millenium, and the coming of the Lord in his glory, to the point from which it started on its circuit round the globe. At present, we lie in the birth-throes of a new creation. All still rolls in wild confusion. But the time is not far, when the divine word shall sound, *Let there be light !* and a beautiful world shall rise from the midst of the struggling chaos." * * * * *

We have thus endeavored to furnish a condensed view of some portions of Dr. Schaff's work. We feel that we have not done it full justice. We have closely adhered, in general to the author's *words*, but are conscious of having, in very many instances, contrary to our own wishes, deprived his style of the freshness and vigor, and his thoughts of the fulness and close connection which characterize them in the work itself. This, in fact, resulted almost necessarily from the method of abridgment pursued by us. By the process of dismemberment the original spirit of the book was destroyed, and however carefully the "*dis-*

jecta membra" were joined together, the life that previously animated them could not be recalled. It would doubtless have been better on some accounts, to have adopted a different method, but many considerations, which we cannot here mention, prevented us from doing this. Those who read the work will understand the difficulties with which we had to contend in our effort to condense. The subject is in fact, condensed by the author himself, into the smallest compass consistent with a clear exhibition. There is nothing superfluous. The illustrations, even where heaped upon each other, in great number, as they frequently are, not only illustrate but also *add* to the main thought. Hence farther condensation was not possible, without squeezing the very marrow and life itself from the book. Those who have *not* yet read the work, but who induced by our remarks may hereafter take it up, will, we are sure forget the roughness of the road by which we lead them, in their delight with the rich field of thought into which they will have arrived.

The concluding chapter of Dr. Schaf's treatise, exhibits "the practical importance of a right view of Church History," and the advantages of his own theory over those generally prevalent in this country. The length of our article already, however, compels us to cease from all farther comment or quotation. Upon a future occasion we may give expression to some thoughts upon the general idea that lies at the bottom of the theory of Historical Development.

Norristown, Pa.

G. D. W.

HUMAN LIBERTY AND FREE AGENCY.

Scarcely any question, connected with theology in general and the science of the human mind in particular, is more important and intricate, than that which has respect to the freedom of the will, or (in more popular language) the free agency of man. The subject has employed the pens, and called forth the efforts, of the ablest writers and most profound thinkers; and yet still remains involved in much difficulty and contention. It is still a matter of controversy in what the free agency of man, or the freedom of the will, precisely and properly consists. That man, in so far as he is an accountable being, is a free agent, that is, one who decides and acts no otherwise than he chooses or wills, would seem to be universally conceded; nor can it well be de-

nied that he is also in a sort a necessary agent, that is, the circumstances in which he is placed, and the causes and effects operating upon him, beyond his control, being such, that it may be said, that he cannot choose or act otherwise than he does. To reconcile these apparently conflicting statements or facts, and to point out scientifically their consistency and harmony, is the great difficulty connected with the subject.

There are two main philosophical theories which are adopted and strenuously advocated in relation to the freedom of the will or the free agency of man. I. That which places the freedom of the will in the force of motives, the will of man always choosing and determining one way or the other in any case, according to the strongest motive, or that which to the individual at the time appears the strongest motive. According to this theory, man is a free (moral) agent, because he never chooses or determines otherwise than he himself wills; but he is also in a sort a necessary agent, because his will is in all cases swayed and determined by the strongest, or that which seems to him the strongest motive. II. The other theory is that which affirms that the Will itself possesses, what is called a self-determining power (sometimes also denominated a liberty of indifference or contingency), in consequence of which it holds the preponderance or balance in its own hands, so that, in view of the motives presented, it is able, to choose and decide of itself, independently, and even in a direction contrary to that to which the strongest motives impel at the time. The former theory is that which is adopted and so strenuously advocated, in opposition to the latter, by "Edwards" in his celebrated treatise "on the Will."

In calling further attention to this subject, I propose, as intelligibly and simply as possible, to ascertain and state the facts involved in the case; and then to notice more particularly the philosophy and theology by which it is attempted scientifically to explain and harmonize these facts. The facts in the case are two: man's free agency and man's necessary agency.

The first prominent fact connected with our subject to which I call attention, is the fact of Man's free agency. And here and elsewhere in this article, I shall be content to adopt and make use of the common phraseology, as that which is most intelligible and level to the capacity of the general reader.

"Philosophy itself," (says Locke *Hum. Und.* p. 162, vol. I) "though it likes not a gaudy dress, yet, when it appears in public must have so much complacency, as to be clothed in the ordinary fashion and language of the country, so far as it can consist with truth and perspicuity."

By a free agent, I understand one, who has the power or capacity of doing or forbearing to do any thing, according to the preference of his own mind. Man is a free moral agent when he has the power, opportunity, or advantage of doing or leaving undone any thing, according as he wills or chooses. He is not a free moral agent when he is under such restraint, hindrance or impediment, that he is unable to do as he wills ; or is necessitated to act in a manner contrary to his will.

Locke, in his treatise on the Human Understanding, uses the following language in respect to Liberty *in general* (vol. I p. 158). "All the actions that we have any idea of, reduce themselves, as has been said to these two, viz : thinking and motion ; so far as a man has a power to think, or not to think, to move, or not to move, according to the preference or direction of his own mind, so far is a man *free*. Wherever any performance or forbearance are not equally in a man's power : wherever doing or not doing will not equally follow upon the preference of his mind directing it, there he is not *free*, though perhaps the action may be voluntary. So that the idea of *liberty* is the idea of a power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action, according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other ; where either of them is not in the power of the agent to be produced by him according to his *volition*, there he is not at *liberty*, that agent is under *necessity*. So that liberty cannot be where there is no thought, no volition, no will ; but there may be will, there may be volition where there is no *liberty*."

Edwards in his work on the Will expresses himself in the following manner, p. 40. "But one thing more I would observe concerning what is vulgarly called Liberty ; namely, that power and opportunity for one to do and conduct as he will, or according to his choice, is all that is meant by it ; without taking into the meaning of the word anything of the cause or original of that choice ; or at all considering how the person came to have such a volition ; whether it was caused by some external motive or internal habitual bias ; whether it was determined by some internal antecedent volition, or whether it was necessarily connected with something foregoing, or not connected. Let the person come by his volition or choice how he will, yet, if he is able, and there is nothing in the way to hinder his pursuing and executing his will, the man is fully and perfectly free, according to the primary and common notion of freedom."

On the following page he thus defines a moral agent. "A moral Agent is a being that is capable of those actions that have

a moral quality, and which can properly be denominated good or evil in a moral sense, virtuous or vicious, commendable or faulty. To moral Agency belongs a moral faculty, or sense of moral evil and good, or of such a thing as desert or worthiness, of praise or blame, reward or punishment; and a capacity which an Agent has of being influenced in his actions by moral inducements or motives, exhibited to the view of understanding and reason, to engage to a conduct agreeable to the moral faculty."

The proof of man's free agency may be briefly reduced and ranged under the following heads: I. The free moral agency of man is a necessary and constituent part of his being as a rational and accountable creature. It belongs to his nature; and is inseparable from it, so long as he is a responsible agent. Whatever may be his state, whether considered as a perfectly holy being, as he was in the person of Adam at his original creation, or as a lapsed and sinful creature, as he now is: whether as an impenitent or as a renewed sinner; as an inhabitant of heaven or of hell; so long as he remains man, rational and accountable and subject to law, he must necessarily be a free agent and liberty of moral action must ever be a constituent attribute of his nature. II. Free agency is a matter of personal consciousness. Every accountable agent is conscious that in so far as his actions have a moral character, he acts freely and voluntarily. Even the inebriate and those chargeable with the grossest criminality, never think of denying (unless as a plea for a special purpose) their free and voluntary action. III. Hence the free agency of man must be assumed as the necessary ground and basis of all accountability. Man is so far, and only so far accountable before God and his fellow man, as he acts freely, that is, in conformity to his own will and choice. This broad principle is the dictate of common sense and agreement, and is recognized without controversy in all law, human and divine. IV. The civil law holds and treats all a man's acts as irresponsible, and all contracts made by him as null and void, if it can be shown that he has not acted as a free agent, but by compulsion or restraint. The acts of an idiot or of a man *non compos mentis*, are not valid, because he is not a free agent; and in the most criminal cases, if it can be proven, that a murderer or culprit is properly insane, the law releases its hold upon him as an offender, however it may be obliged for the public security to take in charge his person. V. The law of God in general, as contained in the ten commandments, supposes and takes for granted the existence and exercise of free and voluntary action. The sum of the whole law and the prophets, according to our Sa-

viour, is comprehended in this: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself," Luke 10-27. The divine law, like every other, would be without meaning and force, unless the subjects of it, were moral agents, free in their choice of obedience or violation. And from the fact that the commandment is addressed to fallen creatures, it is evident that they must, as such, be yet possessed of some kind of capacity and power, to comply with its requirement, provided in the exercise of their free agency they should so choose and determine. It is not the way of the Almighty to require absolute impossibilities; which would be the case, had man no capacity or strength whatever to obey, even if he should so will. His capacity or power (whatever it may be said to be) has indeed become so shattered and ruined by the fall, and as a consequence the commandment so difficult, that it is very certain that in no single instance will it be perfectly kept, by any of the fallen descendants of Adam; still some kind of capacity or strength must be supposed to remain and exist, as the necessary basis or substratum of accountability and moral agency. The law of God literally affirms that man, fallen as he is, has a *heart*, a *soul*, a *strength*, and a *mind*; for the right or perverted use of which he is accountable. And the whole of what the law requires is, that man love the Lord his God, with *all* his heart, with *all* his soul, with *all* his strength, and with *all* his mind, be the same greater or less. This is in conformity with the equitable rule laid down by the apostle, 2 Cor. 8-12. "If there be first a willing mind it is accepted *according to that a man hath and not according to that he hath not.*" Thus is secured, on the one hand, the infinite dignity and perfection of the divine law, and on the other, man's obligation to obedience, whatever be the extent or degree of his capacity. VI. Again, according to the Scriptures, men are censurable and blameworthy, not because they are unavoidably ignorant of their duty (which they are apt to plead), but because knowing or having the opportunity of knowing their duty, they yet in the perversity of their hearts choose to do wickedly. "This is the condemnation," says our Saviour, "that light is come into the world, but men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil," John 3-19. And in another place: "If ye were blind ye had not had sin; but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth." And again, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father. Now

they have no cloak for their sin." VII. Lastly, the accountability of man as a free moral agent, is taught us in every variety of form, in the commands, promises, invitations and threatenings of the Scriptures. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve. Repent that your sins may be blotted out. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned. Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched forth my hands and no man regarded, therefore, &c. Oh, that they were wise, that they understood, that they would consider their latter end. Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the Earth. As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die? Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life. Oh Jerusalem, &c.—but ye would not. The spirit and the bride say come, and whosoever will let him come."

Having presented our statement of one of the great truths or facts connected with our subject, we proceed to a consideration and statement of the other, a seemingly opposite and conflicting fact; viz, the necessary agency of man—Man is not only a free (moral) agent, he is also, in perfect consistency with his free agency, a necessary agent.

By a necessary agent, I mean one whose moral dispositions, and whose circumstances and condition are such, that he is under a kind of necessity of determining and acting just as he does; not however in opposition to, but in perfect agreement with his own choice. The word *necessary* is here used, not as opposed to *voluntary*, but to *uncertainty*. A necessary agent, according to our meaning of the expression, is one, who while he acts freely, acts under the force of condition, circumstances and motives, which render it certain that he will act just as he does, and not otherwise.

It is important for the reader here to understand and bear in mind, that in using the terms *necessary*, and *necessity* in this connection, we do not employ them in their vulgar and popular acceptance. In this view, as Edwards observes (on the Will, p. 24), "A thing is said to be necessary when we cannot help it, let us do what we will." We use the terms in their metaphysical or philosophical import, as expressive of *certainty*. "Metaphysical or Philosophical Necessity is nothing different from certainty."—Edwards on the Will, p. 26. Such a necessity is not a compulsion or coercion to sin, nor is it at all inconsistent with free agency; it only affirms the certainty of men's sinning under particular circumstances, yet in perfect accordance with the voluntary action of their own minds.

In applying to the moral agency of man the terms *necessary* and *necessity*, as expressive of *certainty*, we are only following the usage of the most eminent theologians since the time of the Reformation. Such appears to be the meaning and force of the terms as employed by Calvin; whose doctrine however is sometimes misrepresented, as teaching the absurd and impious notion, that men are under a necessity of committing sin, in the common popular acceptance of the terms. "What God decrees," says Calvin (Book I. chap. 3, sect. 9), "must necessarily come to pass, yet it is not by an absolute or natural necessity;" and he refers for illustration, to "the bones of Christ," which were capable of being broken, yet that they should be broken was impossible, because the Scriptures must certainly be fulfilled—"a bone of him shall not be broken." Thus Luther also says, (*de servo arbitrio*, translated by Milner, *Ecc. Hist.* vol. 5)—"So long as the operative grace of God is absent from us, every thing we do has in it a mixture of evil; and therefore of necessity our works do not avail to salvation. Here," continues Luther, "I do not mean a necessity of compulsion, but a necessity as to the certainty of the event." F. Turretine, whose system of theology is a text book of standard reputation, teaches that the divine decree implies indeed the necessity of future events, but not an absolute or physical necessity, nor a necessity of coercion or force; but only a necessity of the certainty of the future events which are foreseen and decreed, (*respectu certitudinis eventus et futuritionis ac decreto.*)

As the views of Calvin are sometimes greatly misrepresented, it may not be out of place here, to present some extracts from his "institutes," in order to show in what sense he held and taught the doctrine of necessity and human freedom. For these extracts we acknowledge our obligations to the work of W. Anan on "the Difficulties of Arm. Methodism," in which are contained, many sound and forcible statements upon this and other difficult points of Christian doctrine. What did Calvin mean by necessity? This we discover by comparing other passages—thus—"A distinction has prevailed in the schools, of *three kinds of liberty*: the first, freedom from *necessity*; the second, freedom from sin; the third freedom from misery; of which the *first is naturally inherent in man*, so that nothing can deprive him of it; the other two are lost by sin. *This distinction*," adds Calvin, *I readily admit*, except that it improperly confounds *necessity* with *coaction*. And the wide difference between these things will appear in another place."—Book 2, chap. 2, sect. 5, &c. "When man subjected *himself to this necessi-*

ty, he was not deprived of will, but of soundness of will." Augustine thus expresses himself: "The will being changed for the worse, I know not by what corrupt and surprising means, *is itself the author of the necessity to which it is subject, &c.*" Afterwards he says, "that we are oppressed with a yoke, but no other than that of a *voluntary servitude, &c.*" Again, Book 2, chap. 5, sect. 5, "Let them not suppose themselves excused by necessity, *in which very thing* they have a *most evident cause* of their condemnation." For if *we are bound by our passions*, which are *under the government of sin*, so that we are not at liberty to obey our father, there is no reason why we should plead this *necessity* in our defence, the criminality of which is within ourselves, and must be imputed to us."—Book 2, chap. 8, sect. 3. "Nor can we pretend to excuse ourselves by our want of ability—our inability is our own fault."—Ibid. From these passages, adds Mr. A., it is evident that the meaning of the term "necessity" in Calvin's work, is the same with certainty, or what Edwards calls, "*philosophical necessity.*"

The necessary and at the same time free agency of man, may at first view appear to some not only inconsistent, with, but absolutely contradictory to each other; but a moments reflection and consideration of known facts, will show that this cannot be so, however far beyond our ability it may be to offer a satisfactory solution, and answer every objection in the case. The divine being it will be admitted by all is possessed of the most unbounded absolute freedom; there is no power within or without himself that can at all interfere with the perfectly free determinations and acts of the infinite mind: Yet in all his volitions and acts, it may be said that he is impelled by an irresistible necessity to will and act just as he does. God cannot do wrong. He cannot deny himself. He cannot but love holiness and have an infinite aversion to sin. He not only exists but acts from necessity of nature; yet in perfect agreement with the most absolute liberty. Nor is such necessary existence and action at all an imperfection in the supreme being, but on the contrary the evidence of the highest excellency; for if holiness, justice and truth be essential attributes of God, it does not argue imperfection, but supreme and infinite excellency, that he cannot will or act in violation of them. The angels and saints made perfect in heaven, who are no longer in a state of probation, are perfectly holy, yet while they are so necessarily, they are entirely voluntary in their obedience. Satan and his evil angels are necessarily and only evil, yet their continued rebellion is altogether voluntary. The man Christ Jesus was without sin, he could not sin; yet his obedience unto death was altogether free and uncompelled.

That man, in connection with his free moral agency, is also a necessary agent, acting under a sort of necessity, rendering it certain that he will act none otherwise than he does, seems unavoidably to result from the decrees and foreknowledge of God. To those who receive the doctrine of the divine decrees according to the Calvinistic view, the inference is clear and universally conceded, that God's foreordaining and determining whatever comes to pass (either *efficiently* in respect to the good, or *permissively* in respect to evil) renders all events as fixed in the divine plan, necessarily and absolutely certain, in a way and manner however in perfect agreement with the creature's moral freedom and accountability. Nor will it at all help the cause of those who reject the divine decrees in this view, to say that the doctrine makes God the author of sin and destroys the freedom of human action; for solve the difficulty as we may, the same result follows from, and the same objection lies with equal force against, the doctrine of God's simple foreknowledge or knowledge of all things. For to foresee or know any thing infallibly, implies and necessarily secures the certainty of its occurrence. Our concern however at present is not to answer objections, but only to state the fact and inference. A very remarkable and well known illustration of this fact and inference, the Sacred Scriptures present us in the case of the crucifixion. "Him," says the apostle Peter, "being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain," (Acts. ii. 23.) and again, "The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him: (*as it was determined or decreed*—exactly *bounded and marked out* by God, as the word $\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\omega$ most naturally signifies. Doddridge in loco.) but woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed," (Matth. xxvi. 24, Mark xiv. 21.)

The necessary agency of man clearly results from the philosophical doctrine of *motives*, which we regard as the true theory in relation to human freedom. According to this theory, while man acts freely, inasmuch as he follows his own choice; his volitions are also necessary, because his will is always swayed and determined by the strongest prevailing motives, or what to the individual, right or wrong, appears at the time the strongest motive. If this be so, then according as is the disposition of the individual, and the force of the motives operating upon him, will certainly and necessarily in every case, be his volition and determination.

The Sacred Scriptures which, as we have seen, so plainly declare man's free agency and responsibility, are equally explic-

it in affirming his necessary agency, or the certainty of his moral conduct, as good or evil, according to the state of his heart, and his condition as renewed or unrenewed by divine grace. According to the Scriptures, man in consequence of the Fall, is under a kind of impotence or inability, to do otherwise than evil; left to themselves, it is most certain, that all men will disobey, reject the gospel call, and remain obstinately impenitent and unbelieving; further, in order to acceptable obedience man must undergo a moral renovation, must have imparted to him a new principle of spiritual life, for the accomplishment of which the means of grace are of themselves insufficient, and nothing will avail but a special divine influence; when thus renewed the man will as necessarily, truly, and sincerely, although imperfectly, love and obey God, in view of the truths and motives presented, as he formerly did just the contrary. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots? I know that in me, that is in my flesh there dwelleth no good thing. The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then, they that are in the flesh, cannot please God. Which are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. Paul may plant and Apollos may water, but God must give the increase. No man can come unto me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him. Therefore, they could not believe, because he hardened their hearts, and blinded their eyes." In the case of the Lord's hardening the heart of Pharoah, it was only necessary that the divine restraints should be withdrawn, and he left to himself; and the result would follow necessarily as well as certainly.

Having thus acquainted the reader with the two main and essential facts connected with our subject, viz: the fact of man's free agency, and the fact of his necessary agency, it remains that we should yet notice, more particularly yet briefly, the philosophical and theological theories and methods by which it is attempted to harmonize and show the mutual consistency of these facts, in some respects so seemingly opposite and conflicting.

One method of getting over the difficulties growing out of the subject, is to be content to take the facts as we find them, without attempting or being concerned to attempt any solution whatever in the case. To such a matter of fact course, it may be objected indeed that it is any thing but philosophical; it must be admitted, however, that it is the wisest course, which minds of the widest range are constrained to adopt in many similar cases. In respect to God for instance, his Providence extending to all things, and founded in justice, truth, and mercy, is a primary

and essential truth of all religion, natural and revealed. Yet who does not know that events have occurred and are continually occurring, which the limited ken of man is utterly unable to account for, upon any known principles of human justice and benevolence? Job felt this, when in his visitation he was ready to curse the day of his birth; and the mind of the Psalmist himself staggered in view of the prosperity of the wicked and the afflictions of God's people in the present world. Thus also in relation to man, we know assuredly that he is a compound being, composed of an animal and mortal frame which we call body or matter, and of a reasonable and incorruptible soul or spirit, which we denominate mind. But who is able to comprehend fully their mode of union and mutual co-operation? Who can define exactly their respective bounds and limits, and tell where body ends and mind begins, or answer the many other equally perplexing questions which might be proposed? In these and other instances which might be adduced, we never suffer our ignorance of what is unknown to invalidate our faith in what is clearly ascertained; and we are content to receive and practice upon the facts which we know to exist. True wisdom dictates that we should pursue a similar course in relation to the perplexing questions growing out of man's free yet necessary agency; content to leave to the more curious and speculative, the task of reconciling inconsistencies, and solving endless objections.

"And find no end, in wandering mazes lost."

Milt.

I have already referred, in a former part of this article, to the two prominent Philosophical and Metaphysical theories, which are held and advocated in relation to human liberty; viz, the one which makes the freedom of human action to consist in a self-determining power of the will, sometimes also called a liberty of indifference or contingency; and the other, which attempts to account for the phenomena in the case by what is styled the doctrine of motives. According to President Edwards the former theory is maintained "by Armenians, Pelagians and others," the other is that advocated by divines of the Calvinistic school. It may be remarked here that the doctrine of motives (which the writer upon the whole regards as the right one) does not consist in ascribing to them the power of themselves of changing the disposition and renewing the heart, any further than as instrumentalities, effecting the change according to natural principles. Thus Regeneration, as consisting in the giving of a new heart, is the work of God; but motives fixing and holding the

sinner's attention to the truth, are the instrumentalities by which it is brought about, in conformity to the established laws of the human constitution. Motives, as objects of love or aversion, occasion the heart to act *according to its existing disposition*, and there their power ends.

Upon the theory in question, Doctor Griffin in his Park street lectures, page 202, expresses himself to the following effect. His object is to show that God can, without at all impairing the sinner's freedom, so keep up his attention to the truth, as notwithstanding his resistance, to make him a willing subject of his grace. I shall not follow him to the close of his argument, but only quote so much as relates to his statement of the motive doctrine, which is subsequently applied by him to the point under discussion.

"In this place it is necessary to introduce more distinctly the doctrine of *motives*. Either we must admit the self-determining power of the will, holding in its hand the decision whether to yield or not to yield to motives, or we must believe that the will is *absolutely governed by motives*. The latter is unquestionably the truth, and common sense, instructed by experience, pronounces it true every hour of the day. Common sense, delivered from the labyrinths of metaphysics, pronounces that men always yield to the strongest inducement, and are yet free. Upon this principle you are constantly calculating the future conduct of men. You feel a perfect confidence that if you offer a miser a bag of money to induce him to walk a mile, and no stronger motive draws the other way, he will comply; and yet you never dreamed that he would not be free. The whole business of the commercial world is conducted upon the same calculation, and so is the whole system of social intercourse. Break up the uniformity of this principle, and leave it wholly uncertain whether a father will move to snatch a child from the fire, whether a friend will be restrained by a thousand motives from taking your life; and all the foundations of order and rational action are removed, and the world is transformed into one vast bedlam,—a bedlam in which the maniacs are as likely to kill a friend to gain a feather as to win a crown,—as likely to kill a friend without motives, and in full opposition to all motives, as to hurt an enemy when most highly induced. This is a new species of madmen, a world of madmen moving in a maze, without a particle of reflection, without any end or object even floating in a distempered fancy. Such a *self-moving will*, (good Lord deliver us!)—such a self-moving will, unharnessed from reason and let loose into the world, would be more to be dreaded than wolves and

tigers. In short there can be no rational action a whit further than the will is absolutely controlled by motives ; that is to say, a whit further than it has a *reason* for its decisions, and is governed by the considerations which appear strongest and best."

The subject of man's moral agency and freedom enters very deeply into the science of Theology in some of its most important relations. It constitutes in particular the gist and substance of the much litigated question respecting the sincerity and consistency of the gospel call, and man's obligation to obedience. The several distinct theological systems in vogue, may be not unaptly characterized by the different positions from which man's moral freedom and ability is viewed and determined. The following are the three prominent systems prevalent on this point.

I. Some refer us to man's original constitution, to the fact of his having been at first in Adam formed perfectly pure and upright, and capable of yielding the required obedience to the divine law. Adam as the head and root of the human family, having fallen through disobedience, has involved all his posterity in the consequences of his apostacy, entailing on them a corrupted nature, by which they are totally disqualified to render any longer acceptable obedience to the law. Now man having thus fallen, and *lost the power to obey, God has not lost the right to command.* His law is not to be set aside, nor a new one adopted suited to the present condition and ability of creatures, who by the fall of their original Parents have rendered themselves corrupt and impotent.

II. Others in the solution of the difficulty growing out of man's impotence, refer us to the remedial and restorative system introduced by Jesus Christ, the second Adam ; according to which wherever the gospel is rightly dispensed, and the means of grace properly observed, they are accompanied by a power and influence, which is adapted and adequate in all cases, to meet and correct the impotence which is the consequence of man's apostacy. In other words, the preaching of the gospel is accompanied by the communication of *common* grace, and this if rightly improved, will certainly lead to, and result in the communication of *special* grace, by which an individual is enabled truly to repent and believe to the saving of the soul.

III. Others again, in reconciling the impotence of man with his responsibility, resort to a distinction in regard to human *ability* and *inability*, which, on account of its supposed importance and the high authority by which it is supported, deserves a particular notice. The distinction referred to, is that which is made between *natural* and *moral* inability.

"*Moral inability*," says Doctor Smalley in his Dissertation on the subject, "consists only in the want of a heart, or disposition, or will, to do a thing. *Natural inability*, on the other hand, consists in, or arises from, a want of understanding, bodily strength, opportunity, or *whatever may prevent*, our doing a thing, when we are willing, and strongly disposed and inclined to do it. Or, in fewer words thus: Whatever a man could not do, *if he would*, in this, he is under a *natural* inability, but when all the reason why one *cannot* do a thing, is because he does not choose to do it, the inability is only of a *moral* nature."

Doctor Kollock, in one of his excellent sermons, thus simply states and illustrates the distinction. "Inability is of two kinds, natural and moral. Natural inability consists in a defect of rational faculties, bodily powers, or external advantages; this excuses from sin. Moral inability consists only in the want of a proper disposition of heart to use our natural ability aright; this is the essence of sin. We shall illustrate this point by a familiar example. A beggar applies for relief to two different persons: the first says to him, 'I perceive your misery; I know that you ought to be relieved, but I do not possess any property, and therefore I am totally unable to relieve you.' Here is an instance of natural inability, and it perfectly exempts the person from the sin of uncharitableness. The second says to him, 'I perceive your misery; I know that you ought to be relieved; I have a sufficiency of money; but I have such a dreadful hardness of heart that I cannot pity your distresses, and that I am totally unable to relieve you.' Here is an instance of moral inability; instead of excusing from sin, it is that which constitutes the very essence of the sin, and which renders the man uncharitable."

Now the inability which the sinner is under, to obey and repent, is, according to the Scriptures, only and altogether a moral inability. When our Saviour says, "No man *can* come unto me, except the Father draw him," his meaning is explained by the same lips, "Ye *will not* come unto me that ye may have life."—John vi. 44. *Cannot* in a number of instances in the Bible is used to mean simply a strong disinclination.—Gen. xxxvii. 4, Acts. iv. 20, John vi. 60. "*They could not believe*," i. e., they would not.

Such a moral inability, so far from being an excuse, is the very substance and essence of the sinner's criminality; otherwise the more depraved, the more excusable would he be. No civil judge would for a moment entertain such an apology. Accordingly when the sinner says: 'I am excusable because I am morally unable to repent, to believe, to love God,' he says in other words,

'I am excusable, because I have so dreadfully guilty and corrupted a heart, that I have no disposition to repent, to believe, to love God.'

Those who wish to see what can be said *pro* and *con*, in reference to this distinction, are referred to the printed trial of Albert Barnes before the Synod at York; he will find it in the able and succinct argument of the accuser and defendant on the point.

I shall close with a few reflections. I. If free agency belong to man, and be inseparable from his nature, as an accountable being, then, in view of its results in relation to God, ought it, not, instead of being a subject of vain glory and boasting, to be an occasion of shame and deep abasement. Who among the sons of men, has not perverted and abused his freedom?

II If man be a necessary agent, and it be certain that left to himself, he will only sin and that continually, then ought the best and holiest of men, imperfectly sanctified on Earth, to be humble, to feel their dependence, and continually pray, "Lead us not into temptation." "Who maketh thee to differ from another? Or what hast thou, which thou hast not received?"

III. If the inability of man in regard to spiritual things, so far at least as it is blameworthy, be only of a moral nature, and the result of a wrong disposition, then how false, deceptive, criminal and ruinous is the common plea of inability by which men attempt to justify and excuse their disobedience, impenitence and rejection of the gospel. The reader may see this point most powerfully and convincingly urged, by Doctor Griffin, in his "Park St. Lectures," sermon on "The plea of inability considered."

Montgomery co., Pa.

S. H., Jr.

OLD ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH BALLADS.

"O *suavis anima!* qualem te dicam bonam
Antehac fuisse tales cum sint reliquæ!"—*Phædrus* iii. 5.

"O sweet soul! how good must you have been heretofore when your remains are so delicious!"

Admirably applied have the two foregoing lines from *Phædrus* been, by Mr. Addison in the *Spectator*, to the few poetical remains of *Sappho* that have come down to us from antiquity.

The tenth muse, on account of her excellence, was this poetess styled by the antient Greeks who had her works entire, and modern critics, from the choice fragments of her writings preserved, are not disposed to find fault with the appellation. Beautiful specimens they are of passionate, unaffected verse. Frequently have they been translated into different modern languages; and some of our best poets, in spite of the affectation of their times, by imitating her simplicity, have sometimes been enabled to express with greater truthfulness and warmth than perhaps they could otherwise have attained to, the amatorial emotions. With the exception of some very short fragments and epigrams her remains are confined to two amatory odes, one of these not entire, composed in the verse that bears her own name. Selected were these two odes, the one by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the other by Longinus, from her whole stock of writings, as being the finest specimens of lyrical composition, and thus have they come down to us in their works. As the good taste of these two eminent critics is not to be disputed—they certainly selected from her compositions what was best. She may have written something equal therefore, it is possible, but nothing better, and, in all likelihood, a good deal that was worse. On the whole then, for her own memory's sake, I am just as well pleased that her odes have reached us no more numerous nor complete. With greater propriety than even her beloved Anacreon she might have sung:

Ἄ βαρβυτος δὲ Χορδαῖς

Ἐρωτα μόνον ἤχει.

String anew her lyre as she might, it sounded only love. To be surfeited with sweets it is not well. To pronounce on the flavor and body of a wine a few sips are often better for qualifying us than even a hearty draught. Of her writings enough are still remaining to shew us her high poetical genius, and we would leave the rest to our imaginations. In the dim and shadowy land of antiquity she stands at present only half revealed, to be sure, but beautiful in the distance, and we would not wish to destroy the enchantment around her, as perhaps we might, by any nearer view.

After the same manner, in modern literature, I am just as well pleased that some of our old ballads have come down to us not entire. In this case, however, not for the sake of their authors am I well satisfied, as these are wholly unknown, but for the sake of the productions themselves. Of old ballads that have

reached us from former centuries unimpaired it is a characteristic trait that they are not always pervaded throughout by the same uniform excellence. Composed, in most cases, no doubt, by illiterate strollers, in some parts they fall often below even the worst prose, while in others, on account of their true simplicity and genuine pathos, they rise superior to any thing of a kindred sort in modern verse. With respect to those then that have reached us not entire it is natural to suppose that, as the populace would treasure up more fondly those parts which came home to their feelings and made the deepest impression, in being orally transmitted from one generation to another, these were the very parts which were not the soonest lost but the longest preserved. In their antiquated language they resemble old ruins, broken down, to be sure, in part, but not desolate nor devoid of beauty. An evergreen humanity they contain which becomes not arid, but is ever springing forth and covering them over as with the freshest moss and ivy. No modern hand should ever attempt their reparation. In filling up their breaches great injury is always done to their solemn grandeur and natural freshness. It knocks off a great deal of their ivy and ancient cast. They belong to their own hallowed times and their green old-age should be respected. No modern, however rich in imagination and steeped in romantic lore, can so thoroughly transport himself amid the scenes and manners of the past as to be able to reproduce its genuine poetry. Even its emotions and peculiar modes of thought should he succeed in entering into, he will certainly fall short in the diction. Its ruinous old verbiage he cannot so organically reconstruct as not to show some artificial arrangement and modern phraseology. His high finish and over-refinement displayed will show too much of his own age. O Shade of Thomas Chatterton! Nurtured in black-letter while on earth and walking amid the show of olden times, casting over their gray ruins and recalled pageantry the fresh but lurid dawn of thine own enchanted life, with all thy rich imagination thou couldst not divest thyself entirely of modern phraseology and manners and assume the ancient!

In repairing a lonely fragment, however, instead of attempting an antiquated reconstruction of the whole, the modern bard is mostly better pleased with renovating, in later language, the antique relic itself; as thus he can make it chime in better with his own polished additions. Its scenes and incidents he may still leave in their own barbarous times, but he clothes them in the more refined diction of his own. By the introduction of pieces prepared in this way our English literature, we admit, has

sometimes been greatly benefitted, when, in its history, it had gone all too far astray from nature. Thus during the latter part of the Seventeenth century it is well known that the prevailing taste of the learned had become either too classical or too metaphysical. It avoided simplicity and scenes of common life as things prosaic and sought after absurd conceits, preposterous metaphors, scholastic ornaments and pagan machinery. The treasures of the olden poets were left neglected and ballads were given over to the vulgar. Towards reclaiming this perversion, Dryden, with all his faults, at the close of this century, did something, we allow, by renovating, in more polished language, the old romantic tales of Chaucer. Prior too, at the beginning of the eighteenth century did perhaps a little towards the same object by paraphrasing the simple old ballad of the Not-browne Mayde; and even Pope conferred his mite by turning into the smoothliest flowing verse the Temple of Fame and perhaps some other poems of Chaucer. Nevertheless, though the age was benefitted, we cannot help lamenting the native worth of the authors thus despoiled, and feel disposed to exclaim in the words of Juvenal:

“Quanto præstantius esset
Numen aquæ, viridi si margine clauderet undas
Herba, nec ingenuum violarent marmora tophum!”

How much lovelier would be
The water's Genius, if with margent green
The grass enclosed its waves, nor marble marred
The charms of native tuff-stone!

It was not, however, till after the middle of this same century that Bishop Percy accomplished more than all by the publication of his *Relics of Ancient Poetry*; which, however, for the most part, it is well known, are not properly relics at all, but renovations or enlargements merely of old ballads. Still they brought in a revived relish for what is simple and natural in poetry, expressed in words mostly of Saxon origin, at a time when with the classic, to be sure, but often too grandiloquent phraseology of Dr. Johnson and his followers the reading public had been well nigh over sated. For the poets and critics, of the “Lake School,” however, at the beginning of the present century, it was reserved to come to the full understanding in this matter. While of old English poetry and ballads they imitated the simplicity, sometimes, it is acknowledged, even to a fault, they never assumed their antiquated diction. By imitating the natural style

of these merely they sought to impart new beauty and freshness to modern poetry ; but they loved and revered still the old poets themselves and never thought of superseding them. Indeed of the critics of this school, of Hazlett, Lamb and Hunt, for instance, it was the main intent to bring back into proper estimation the works of ancient authors ; and by their judicious criticisms and praises they have certainly well succeeded. To make ourselves acquainted with the rich descriptions of Chaucer we never think, now-a-days of having recourse to the diluted versions of Dryden or Pope, and to arrive at the wealth of Shakespeare, certainly not of betaking ourselves to the *improved* edition of that poet's works by Nahum Tate. We prefer at once to drink from "the well of English undefiled." Not to the age of Queen Anne nor of any of her successors, but to that of Queen Elizabeth is now awarded the high distinction of being called the Augustan age of English literature.

My only regret is that the prevailing taste for what is excellent in old poems is not accustomed, from want of opportunity and not of disposition I cannot help thinking, to feast itself also on fragments of old ballads. Of these, even in England, genuine collections are rare, confined mostly to private libraries, and in our own country how few of us have ever had the delightful privilege of reading one in black-letter. Published collections, like those of Percy and Scott, I know, are not uncommon, but their ballads are generally all filled out and modernized. From old fragments our later poets catching inspiration have often given us beautiful poems, I admit, but certainly these should not supersede entirely the originals. When placed together, like the two "brigs of Ayr," described by Burns, though upbraiding each other, they are both shown off to better advantage by their ancient and modern contrast. Graphic, for instance, are the following lines, from Lochiel's Warning, by Campbell :

"But hark ! through the fast-flashing lightnings of war,
What steed to the desert flies frantic and far ?
'Tis thine, oh Glen Ulien ! whose bride shall await,
Like a love-lighted watch-fire, all night at the gate :
A steed comes at morning—no rider is there ;
But the bridle is red with the sign of despair !"

But for touching simplicity are they at all superior to the old Scottish fragment by which, no doubt, they were, in part, suggested ?

“ Hie upon Hielands
 And low upon Tay,
 Bonnie George Campbell
 Rade out on a day.
 Saddled and bridled
 And gallant rade he;
 Hame came his gude horse,
 But never cam he !

“ Out cam his auld mithier
 Greeting fu’ sair,
 And out cam his bonnie bride
 Rivin’ her hair.
 Saddled and bridled
 And bootied rade he ;
 Toom^a hame came the saddle
 But never cam he !”

What a picture of domestic affliction, heightened by contrast with the gallant setting out in the morning, is here called up, in a few lines, all the more graphic from being incomplete ! Its own affrighted steed the fragment resembles, before the forlorn mansion, with saddle “toom,” nostrils dilated wide and eyes glaring wild, all the more sublime from his being unable to tell a word of his lost rider. The Monody on the Burial of Sir John Moore, by Wolfe, was pronounced by Byron the best lyric in the English language ; and its having been set to music and become afterwards universally popular is a proof that his praise was not misapplied. It was inspired, no doubt, almost wholly by the sad and solemn occasion on which it was written, but I cannot help thinking that the author may have caught something at least of its measure, if not of its mood, from the old Scottish fragment, which he may formerly have read and admired, of Bartram’s Dirge. In a modern collection of old ballads we are told that this was “taken down by Mr. Surtees from the recitation of Anne Douglas, an old woman that weeded in his garden.” We only wish that Mr. Surtees had given it as it fell from the old woman’s lips without any of his modern touches. As it stands now it is still eminently beautiful, we admit, and deserving to be placed along side of the monody of Wolfe, but it has certainly lost something of its ancient cast. Its general character, we are sorry to say, is no longer altogether that of the genuine “old and antique song.”

^a Tearing.

^a Empty.

" They shot him dead at the Nine-stone Rig,
Beside the headless Cross,
And they left him lying in his blood,
Upon the moor and moss.

" They made a bier of the broken bough,
The sauch ' and the aspin gray,
And they bore him to the Lady Chapel,
And waked him there all day.

" A lady came to that lonely bower
And threw her robes aside,
She tore her ling long yellow hair,
And knelt at Bartram's side.

" She bathed him in the Lady-Well,
His wounds sae deep and sair,
And she plaited a garland for his breast,
And a garland for his hair.

" They rowed him in a lily-sheet
And bare him to his earth,
And the Gray Friars sung the dead man's mass
As they pass'd the Chapel Garth.

" They buried him at the mirk midnight,
When the dew fell cold and still;
When the aspin gray forgot to play,
And the mist clung to the hill.

" They dug his grave but a bare foot deep
By the edge of the Nine-stone Burn,
And they covered him o'er with the heather flower,
The moss and the Lady fern.

" A Gray Friar staid upon the grave
And sang till the morning tide,
And a friar shall sing for Bartram's soul
While the Headless Cross shall bide."

From Scottish ballad poetry we have taken the two foregoing specimens, when perhaps more properly, to suit our subject, we should have chosen some from what is English. The fact is,

' Willow.

however, beautiful as the ballads of "Merry England" are, those of Romantic Scotland, it must be said, excel mostly in touching incident and vivid description. The legends of a country, it is well known, are tintured and inspired always, not only by the manners and customs of the people themselves, but also by the beauty or sublimity of the scenery in the midst of which they have arisen. From the loneliness of the gray and misty moors of Scotland and the wildness of her mountain glens and dashing torrents—

"Land of the mountain and the flood,
Land of brown heath and shaggy wood"—

her ballads catch a stirring sublimity, as well as, from the deadly frays of rival clans "fought over again in song," often a thrilling tragic interest. On the other hand, the rich and highly cultivated tracts of land along the storied streams of England, her gray towers of abbeys embowered amid ancient oaks and elms and hamlets sleeping in their vales, impart to her songs of this kind, for the most part, more of the charm of quietude and repose. They are more contemplative than active, more epic than lyric. Nevertheless, as the scenes of Scottish legends were generally laid along the Border and those of England in the "North Countrye," from their proximity it happened that the same ballads were often sung on both sides of the Tweed, and sometimes merely parts of one were borrowed and fitted on to those of another, receiving always, however, different modifications and improvements to suit the respective feelings of each people; and in such cases, it must be said that those applied on the Scottish side were generally the best. In the Scottish ballad of the Douglas Tragedy, for instance, how deadly and lasting was the wrath of the old knight against Lord William, who had carried off his daughter and slain his seven sons who were following hard after, is well set forth by his pulling up afterwards and flinging into the Loch, from the tomb of the lover, the presumptuous brier, because it dared to lean over and entwine itself with the branches of the—alas!—too loving red rose on the grave of his lamented daughter.

"Lord William was buried in St. Marie's kirk,
Lady Margaret in Marie's quire;
Out o' the lady's grave grew a bonny red rose,
And out o' the knight's a brier.

"And they twa met and they twa plat,
And fain they would be near,
And a' the world might ken right weel,
They were twa lovers dear.

"But bye and rade the Black Douglas,
And wow but he was rough!
For he pull'd up the bonny brier,
And flang'd it in St. Marie's Loch."

In comparison how tame and yet lofty, to be sure, in conceit to the exclusion of all feeling, is the somewhat similar tail-piece, which, however, I half suspect is a modern attachment intended to out do the Scottish, to the old English ballad of Fair Margaret and Sweet William!

"Margaret was buryed in the lower chancèl
And William in the higher:
Out of her brest there sprang a rose,
And out of his a briar.

"They grew till they grew unto the church-top
And they could grow no higher;
And there they tyed in a true lovers knot,
Which made all the people admire.

"Then came the clerk of the parish,
As you the truth shall hear,
And by misfortune cut them down,
Or they had still been there."

O most lame and impotent conclusion! Some ancient charms, however, this old English ballad still retains in spite of modern handling, from which it was that David Mallet, Esq. mistook the following lines,—

"When it was grown to dark midnight,
And all were fast asleep,
In came Margaret's grimly ghost
And stood at William's feet,"—

for a lonely fragment, as he found them in Fletcher's "Knight of the Burnin Ppestle," and naked of ornament and simple as they are, he tells us, they struck his fancy; whereupon, using them for a base, he completed upon them a superstructure of his own, called Margaret's Ghost, "one of the most beautiful ballads,"

says Bishop Percy, "in our own or any language." Beautiful indeed are the similes and antitheses with which it abounds, and its versification has all the smoothness of the times of its author, who was cotemporary and intimate with Pope; but after all, I must say, for my own part, I am just as well pleased, if not better, with the wild irregularity and varied incident of the old English ballad, notwithstanding its tail-piece, from which the first stanza of this, burnished up, to be sure, was taken; and in genuine pathos it is certainly far inferior to the modern Scottish ballad, well known in this country, on a theme somewhat similar, called Mary's Dream or Sandy's Ghost.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

WILBERFORCE ON THE INCARNATION.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in its relation to Mankind and to the Church. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A. M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. First American from the second London Edition. Philadelphia: H. Hooker & Co., 1849, pp. 411. 12 mo.

We are not exactly prepared to pronounce this book, in the language of *some* of its admirers, the greatest theological work of the age. Our Episcopal friends are apt to be a little too fast in claiming credit in this style for the literature of their own Church, and a good deal too dull in perceiving or acknowledging the merit of any literature besides. They are quite too starched and pedantic especially, in their bearing towards the theology of Germany. It is only ridiculous however to fancy the English Church, or the Episcopal Church in America, on any sort of parallel and level, as regards theological science, with German Protestantism under its better form. There is no doubt on the English side a vast fund of traditional orthodoxy and order, which at this time particularly cannot well be held in too high account; and there are errors and heresies too in the thinking of Germany, as we all know, that need to be guarded against with the most jealous and watchful care. But mere tradition can never be made to stand in the place of thought; nor are heresies to be cured, by a declaration of war against all philosophy and science. Theology, to live, must be something more than a form of sound words. It must grapple with error, and overcome it. Its mission is to be scientific, as well as true to

the faith once delivered to the saints. In this respect, Germany with all her errors stands far in advance both of England and America. She is the land emphatically of Protestant theology. Not only is she entitled to the first rank in what regards the outward apparatus of the science, as most are now willing to admit; her primacy is equally clear in all that pertains to its true inward life and substance. We need her help not only in philology and history, but in the settlement and defence also of all christian doctrines. The theology of Germany, for years past, has been more wakeful, more profoundly earnest, more vigorously active, than that of all the world besides. The theology of this country, with all its pretension and cant, is for the most part mere schoolboy pedantry in comparison. This scientific activity may not save the German Church; at least not without help, under a different form, from some other quarter; but it cannot fail to prove at last of high consequence for the christian world. It belongs to the inmost power of Protestantism, and forms in some sense what must be considered the central stream of its life. The dangers which attend it are to be surmounted by its own resources, and not by refusing to look them in the face. If our remedy for error is to be found in mere outward authority, a faith that owns no fellowship whatever with science, it were better for us to fall back at once fully and wholly into the arms of Romanism. Admit this principle, and Protestantism stands convicted of falsehood from the start. It has no right to exist. Say that Protestantism has no power to take care of itself in following out its own law, but needs to be overruled and controlled in its course by a purely foreign authority, saying to it, Thus far shalt thou go but no farther; and we have the whole question of its legitimacy conclusively settled. It is for this reason, and in this view, that the problem of Protestantism may be said to be specially involved in the course of theological science at present in Germany. For whatever may be needed to make the Church complete in the end, it is clear that all other interests must be ruled sooner or later by the authority of ideas; theory must underlie all solid life and practice; and the heart of any movement is found consequently, where its theoretic or ideal character is made most actively the subject of thought. The question whether Protestantism has a right to exist, turns after all not so much on the practical working of Episcopacy in Great Britain, or of Puritanism in America, as it does on the results of theology in Germany. If the *idea* of the Reformation, its original and proper theory, be found unequal to the test to which it is here subjected, it is vain to imagine that it can command the

faith and homage of the world lastingly on any other ground. Let it appear that Protestant theology, under its most free and active character, not only calls forth such terrible errors as have appeared in Germany, but has no power also at the same time to overcome them by a still more vigorous vindication of the truth, and the Roman controversy, as we take it, is fairly brought to an end. If Protestantism cannot think itself out to its last consequences without landing us in rationalism and pantheism, we need no other argument to set aside its claims from the beginning. It is proved at once to be a failure under its more respectable forms, as well as under those that are openly anti-christian and false; and we are bound to save ourselves from its bad authority, not by allowing it wilfully only to a certain point, but by abjuring it altogether. It is in this view, we say, that Protestantism universally, whether the fact be perceived or not, has a deep and vital interest in the theological activity of modern Germany, notwithstanding its errors and heresies, more than in the thinking of any other part of the christian world. Let us be willing all round to do justice to its claims, and not affect to be independent of its co-operation and help. If we can go beyond its measure, well; but this we can never do, by superciliously ignoring or overlooking the whole field of inquiry here offered to our view. The questions with which this German theology is occupied, are questions that lie in the way of all true theological science, and challenge the respect of all really earnest and thoughtful minds. Nor is it easy to speak in too high terms of the learning and intellectual power, with which they are discussed. If theology exist as a science at all, at the present time, it is in Germany. We are made to smile accordingly, when we hear a single English work, like that of Wilberforce, referred to as *the* great production of the age in the department to which it belongs, without the least regard apparently to this fact. All who are acquainted with the later German theology, know that the age abounds with great productions in this form. It would be easy to name many theologians not only of equal but of superior learning, and many works also of far more thorough and complete execution, which must be allowed largely to divide at least the theological credit of the age with *Wilberforce on the Incarnation*.

We have no wish however to disparage the merits of this book. It is in truth worthy of high admiration and respect. It deserves to be welcomed as a work of thorough independent learning, which may well be taken to form something of an epoch in the history at least of English theology. We only wish that it may

be widely read and studied, both in England and in this country; for we are sure that it is suited to the wants of our reigning Christianity, whether theoretically or practically considered, and that it cannot fail to operate auspiciously, where it gains attention, in favor of truth and piety. Unfortunately it is not as well fitted as it might be for common popular use. The subject itself of which it treats, is one that lies out of the range of ordinary thought; but there is a serious fault besides, as regards popularity, in the author's method and style. It is fashionable to speak of the darkness and vagueness of German writers; and we are willing to allow that a good many of them are well entitled to such reproach; but we must say we have found it more of an effort to keep the clue of thought steadily in this English book, than to read understandingly some of the hardest German ones that come in our way. Wilberforce is for us decidedly a more *misty* writer than Dorner, for instance, or Rothe, or Daub, or even Kant himself in his Criticism of the Understanding. The difficulty with these writers generally is in the arduous character of their thought, and in this alone; whereas in the work before us it lies often to a very considerable extent in the representation of the thought. The plan of the book, as a whole, is not sufficiently clear; it is put together somewhat clumsily and awkwardly in its several parts; a sort of continual haziness surrounds the progress of its argument; the language is often careless, and lacks throughout the transparency and vivacity that are needed for full popular effect. The work, with all its merits, is decidedly heavy and hard to read. We are sorry for this; as it may prove a bar in some measure to its favorable reception, where it might otherwise have found free passport and exerted a happy influence on the side of truth. The theme with which it is occupied is one of the very highest interest, lying at the foundation of all sound theology, and carrying with it claims to attention, particularly for the present age, beyond perhaps any other that could well be named. It is handled here too, so far as actual substance is concerned, in a truly learned and masterly manner; so as to be every way worthy of coming into respectful audience and consideration with all who take pleasure in divinity, whether in the Episcopal Church or on the outside of it. At the same time, as we have had too much opportunity to know, the theme, with all its vast significance, is for a large part of our reigning religious thought by no means palatable; for the reason precisely that it runs counter to many of its traditional prejudices, and is felt to involve practical consequences in the end, which it has become a sort of settled maxim with it to resist tooth

and nail in defiance of all examination. The age, however tolerant it may be in other directions, has no toleration at all generally for the idea of the *Church* or for the mystery of the *Sacraments*; and is but too ready to turn away with impatient disgust from any theological inquiry that leads this way. With all its professed love for liberty and light, it is apt here to resent everything like free investigation, and to shrink from *science* as though its presence were only suited to give pain. In such circumstances, it is to be regretted that the work before us should not have every outward advantage along with it, to assist it in commanding for its great subject the homage, which this has a right to claim, but at the same time so little power with too many to enforce. We are apprehensive that it is not reaching any such circulation, nor gaining any such earnest attention, as may be counted at all commensurate with its deserts. It seems to be received only with a sort of half-complaisance at best even in the Episcopal Church; while almost no notice whatever is taken of it among other denominations; for the simple reason perhaps that it is felt to move in a foreign sphere of thought, with which only *churchmen*, in the Episcopal sense, are regarded as having any sympathy or concern.

With all the prejudices of the age however towards the subject here brought into view, it is clear enough that this belongs notwithstanding to the proper religious life of the age itself, and that it is forcing itself more and more from all sides, in spite of prejudice, upon its consideration and regard. It is not uncommon, nor unnatural, for an idea or tendency to be at once resisted and responded to, in this way, by the life of an age, whose inmost necessity perhaps it comes both to interpret and fulfil. A new spirit of thought plainly is beginning to prevail in regard to Christ's *person*. Even in New England, theology may be seen gradually waking to an interest, which a few years since was wanting altogether, in what may be called the Christological Mystery, with more or less apprehension of its living concrete relations to the constitution of the world and the course of history. Questions which not long ago were considered fully settled, and laid away as shelf abstractions, on the hypostatical union and its practical results, are now, whether men choose to be pleased with it or not, asserting their right to be re-studied, and settled over again, with something of the same sort of interest that is given to immediately present realities of corresponding moment in the sphere of nature. It is coming to be widely felt that theology needs a regeneration, as well as our christian life generally, and that this must turn on a clearer and more power-

ful apprehension of what is comprehended in the person of Christ himself, as the true centre and fountain at the same time of all truth and grace besides. Christology is acquiring, in this way, new significance, as a world of truth within itself, from whose bosom only, fairly entered in the first place by faith, it can ever be possible to understand either the nature of God or the nature of man. In all such tendencies and indications, come from what quarter they may, we unfeignedly rejoice. They carry in them a promise of good for the future; while they serve to reveal also the ephemeral character of what is different or contrary in the present. The fashion of our present reigning theology, with all its affected self-sufficiency, is evidently doomed to pass away. The mind of the christian world is coming to regard it more and more with misgiving and distrust; and on all sides the persuasion gains ground that the Christological Question, embracing the true idea of the Church and its relation to the Saviour's living person, is in truth the great question of the age, and carries in itself a power by which all the interests of religion are to be moulded hereafter into new shape.

We propose no formal analysis of Wilberforce on the Incarnation, nor any examination of its several parts in detail. Our object is rather to call attention to what we conceive to be the immense practical significance of the general subject with which it is occupied; which may be best done perhaps, by singling out some of the leading aspects under which it is here made to challenge our regard, and holding them up to separate contemplation, without any particular respect to the author's plan. These will be found to agree substantially with views which are presented in our own book entitled *The Mystical Presence*; and we shall be glad certainly if the high authority by which they are now endorsed in this very able and learned English work, may serve to win for them in any quarter, a more earnest consideration than they have yet been able to engage under a simply American garb.

I. The *Mediation* of Christ holds primarily and fundamentally in the constitution of his person. With our current theology this is not admitted. The Mediatorial office is taken to be a sort of outward investiture, for which it was necessary indeed that Christ should have certain previous qualifications, but which is to be regarded still in this view as holding out of his person and beyond it; like the work assigned to Moses for instance, when he was selected and appointed to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, and to give them the Law at Mount Sinai. Two parties, God and man, are thought of as in a state of variance, and

as needing reconciliation ; a certain service is required for this purpose, it may be in the way of negotiation and persuasion simply, or it may be in the way of work, obedience, sacrifice, atonement ; and to meet this requirement, under such purely outward view, Christ is regarded as assuming the character of a day's man or arbitrator, and as coming *between* the parties thus in order to bring them together. He may be considered a mere Prophet, in the Unitarian sense, who saves by his excellent doctrine and holy example ; or he may be allowed to be far more than this, a Saviour possessed of truly Divine powers, according to the orthodox faith, by the mystery of the incarnation, who takes away sin by suffering the penalty of it in his own person ; but still in either case, the thing done has its proper seat and substance in the relation of the parties concerned by itself considered, while Christ as the doer of it stands always as it were on the outside of the transaction, in the character comparatively of an instrument or servant to his own glorious work. Now every such view of redemption we hold to be more or less inadequate and false ; and it is of the utmost consequence, we think, that attention should be fully fastened on the point, for the purpose of promoting a more just apprehension of this great mystery in its true nature and power. The Mediation of Christ, we say, holds primarily and fundamentally in the constitution of his person. His Incarnation is not to be regarded as a device *in order* to his Mediation, the needful preliminary and condition of this merely as an independent and separate work ; it is itself the Mediatorial Fact, in all its height and depth, and length and breadth.

"His name of Mediator," says our author, "is not bestowed by reason of any work, in which He was occasionally or partially occupied ; it sets forth that office, which resulted from the permanent union in one person of God and Man. For the benefits which He bestows upon man's nature result from his being the link which binds it to Deity. The salvation of Adam's race depends upon the influence of that higher nature, which has been introduced into it from above. This gift was first bestowed upon humanity in the Person of Christ, that from Him it might afterwards be extended in degree to all His brethren." He is accordingly not *a* Mediator, but *the* Mediator between God and Man ; as Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 5, allows *one* only, in such way as to exclude all others. There may be a number of relative mediators between God and men, but there can be only one who is the absolute junction and union of the two parties thus distinguished. "Christ is the real bond by which Godhead and hu-

manity are united. And this arises not from any technical and artificial appointment; He bears this name, because He is what it expresses. His title follows from His nature, as effect from cause, as consequent from antecedent. He truly is what no other is, or can be beside Him, the Pattern Man, the second Adam; therefore no other can take his place among the generations of mankind." The Mediation of Christ is his actually binding the nature of God and the nature of Man into one life, in his own person. "For this cause the Son of God consented to become the Son of Man: 'When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.' Moses acted as mediator, Christ became one." The Christian faith, as set forth by the universal Church from the beginning, looks first accordingly not to our Lord's acts so much as to the mystery of his personality. "It has sometimes been asked why our Lord's Atonement is not inserted in the Creed, in such express words as his Incarnation. The reason is, that our Lord's Atonement may be admitted in words, although those who use them attach no christian sense to the doctrine which they acknowledge; whereas if the doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation is once truly accepted, His Mediation follows as its necessary result. So that the Church was guided by Divine Wisdom, to make this article of our Lord's real nature the criterion of her belief, the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*: it holds a leading place in the profession which in all ages has been required at Baptism; and the early believers gave a token of their reverence, when on declaring that He 'was made man,' they were wont, with one consent, to bow the knee and worship." Christ's person is thus at once the centre and comprehension of all functions discharged on God's part towards man, or on man's part towards God. He is the sole channel of grace, and the only medium through whom our prayers can ascend acceptably to heaven. "This is the place wherein heaven and earth are connected; the bridge which joins them together. He is the *door*, the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*."—P. 170–173.

It makes all the difference in the world for our theology, whether the Christian Salvation be apprehended as a living fact thus starting in the person of Christ, or as an arrangement or economy simply in the Divine Mind which Christ came into the world to serve in an outward and instrumental way. Every evangelical doctrine becomes different, as seen either from the one of these points of view or from the other. It is not enough that the articles of our faith may carry in any case separately an orthodox sound; all depends on the order in which they are

bound together, the principle from which they proceed, their interior genealogy and connection as parts of a common whole. The most orthodox formula may be full of heresy, if abstracted from the real ground of Christianity, and made to stand before us as a naked word or thought in some other form. The true order of the Christian faith is given in the Creed. All rests on the mystery of the Incarnation. *That* is itself Christianity, the true idea of the Gospel, the new world of grace and truth, in which the discord of sin, the vanity of nature, the reign of death, are brought forever to an end. Here is an order of life which was not in the world before, the Word made Flesh, God and Man brought into living union in the person of Jesus Christ, as the nucleus and fountain of salvation for the race. He is the Mediator, because God and Man are thus in a real way joined together and made one in his person. The primary force of his character in this view, the power which belongs to him to make reconciliation and atonement, lies in the fact that the parties between whom he mediates are in truth united first of all in the very constitution of his own life. He is in this way the actual *medium* of their conjunction. The mission of salvation which he came to fulfil was not indeed at once completed by the mystery of the hypostatical union; his Mediatorship involved a history, a work, the execution of prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices, a life of suffering and trial, the atonement, the resurrection, the sitting at the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to judge the world; but all this only as the proper and necessary result of the first mystery itself, the entrance of the Divine Word in a living way into the sphere of our fallen Humanity. This brought heaven and earth together in the very heart or centre of the world's life, and carried in itself the guaranty that all which was required to make the union permanent and complete should in due order be triumphantly accomplished. Conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ must necessarily suffer also and die, but only that by doing so he might conquer death, and bring in everlasting righteousness and immortal life for the nature he came to redeem and save. Forth from this sublime Fact proceeds the presence of the Holy Ghost, the power of a new creation in the world, the mystery of the Church, one, holy and catholic, and the whole process of salvation from the remission of sins in baptism on to the resurrection of the last day. The sense of Christ's Person, as the true bond that reconciles God and Man, brings along with it all this faith; and no article, we repeat it, deserves to be considered part of the Christian Creed, which comes not to be of

force in this order and on this ground. The early Church stood here on the true foundation. The Creed, as held from the beginning, forms the true and only legitimate basis of Christian orthodoxy. It needs, in this view, no condescending indulgence, no apology, no qualification, no surreptitious foisting of a new and better sense into its ancient phraseology. Any modern system which finds this necessary, however creditable and plausible it may appear in other respects, stands convicted by the very fact of being itself in a false position. No doctrine can be valid and worthy of trust in the world that comes from Christ, which is not inwardly rooted in the Christological mystery of the old Creed. As an *abstraction*, a thing of mere thought and notion, supposed to hold in the relations of God and man out of Christ, and beyond the power of the concrete Fact embodied in his person, all pretended orthodoxy is reduced at last to a mere empty sham. Even as it regards the nature of God or the nature of man separately taken, our faith and science become truly *christian*, only when they are conditioned by a lively apprehension of what has come to pass in Christ. Where sympathy with the Creed is dull, and inward sense for its grandeur gone, there may still be much talk of God's attributes and works in a different view, of election and reprobation, of man's natural depravity, of justification by faith, regeneration, and other such high evangelical themes; but there can be no really sound and vigorous theology at any point. We will not hear, in such case, those who pretend to plant themselves on the authority of the *Bible*, while they are guilty of such palpable falling away from the mind of the Church in the age when the New Testament was formed; for the very point here to be settled, is the true sense and meaning of the Bible; and what we maintain is, that the early Church is more to be trusted than they are, in regard to what constitutes the primary conception of Christianity, which must serve as a rule to guide us in the proper study of the Scriptures. The Bible rests on Christ. Light is not more necessary for seeing the world, than the idea of Christ is for reading the true mind of God in his written word. The indwelling Creed, in this view, must underlie our use of the Bible, if it is to be at all just and safe. To say otherwise, is to subordinate the Bible to that which is *not* original Christianity, the thinking of this man or that, or the thinking of a sect in no union with the Fact of the Christian faith as it stood in the beginning; and surely when it comes to this, there ought to be no great difficulty, one would think, in deciding which alternative it is the part of wisdom, not to say faith, to choose. However grating it may sound

to some ears, the truth needs to be loudly and constantly repeated: The Bible is not the *principle* of Christianity, neither its origin, nor its fountain, nor its foundation. For the opposite imagination is not by any means an innocent or powerless error. It strikes at the essence of Christianity, which is neither doctrine nor law but living grace, and tends to resolve it into a mere abstraction, a theory, that has its being in the world in men's thoughts mainly, and not in any more substantial form; which, carried out to its legitimate end, is just what we are to understand by Rationalism. It is of the utmost account to see, on the contrary, that the principle of Christianity is the Lord Jesus Christ himself, the Word made Flesh, the Christological Fact underlying, as in the Creed, the new heavens and the new earth. With the sense of this old faith in the mind, no difficulty whatever is found in recognizing it as the true voice also of the Bible. It springs into view from all sides; and the only wonder is, how it should be possible for any, under the power of the uncatholic theory, *not* to perceive and acknowledge its force. Christ is always, in the New Testament, the sum and substance of his own salvation; the way, the truth, the life; the divine *καταλλαγή*, reconciliation or atonement, in whom God appears reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor. v. 18, 19); the victory over death and hell; the true ladder of Jacob's vision, by which the heavens are brought into perpetual free and open communion with the earth. He is the Peace of the world, the deepest and last sense of Man's life, by which all its other discords are harmonized, in the deep toned diapason of its real union with God.

II. This conception implies that the sense and power of Man's life universally considered come to view only in Christ; on which account the mystery of the incarnation, as revealed in his person, is no isolated portent or prodigy, but a fact that holds in strict *organic and historical continuity and unity with the life of the human world as a whole*. In no other view can the mystery be regarded as real. Christ is indeed the entrance of a *new* life into the world, the Word clothing itself with flesh; but he is this, at the same time, in the way of an actual, and not simply apparent, entrance into the world. He was no theophany, but a real and proper man, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. In this character however he could not be merely a common man, one of the race as it stood before. Such a supposition would belie the other side of his being. As the beginning of a new and higher creation, his entrance into the world must be of universal force, a fact of force for humanity in its collective view.

In no other way can the mystery be apprehended as real. Make Christ either a common man, sharing humanity with Moses, David, Peter and Paul, or in lieu of this a man wholly on the outside of this humanity as it belongs to others; and in both cases the conception of his Mediatorial character is gone, lost in Ebionitism on the one side or lost in fantastic Gnosticism on the other. The person of Christ, as Mediator, is of universal human significance and force. So the Scriptures teach when they call him the *Second Adam*; a title plainly implying that he is to be regarded in some way as the root of the race, in a deeper sense even than this can be affirmed of the First Adam. It is accordingly a vast mistake, contradicting alike the letter and the spirit of the Gospel, and leading to consequences of enormous mischief, when the Christian Salvation is taken to be in its primary purpose and plan for a part of the race only, a certain number of individuals as such, and not for Humanity as a whole. It must terminate on individuals indeed, and this involves an "election of grace;" but like all *Life*, it is universal before it becomes thus particular and single, and the single christian is saved only by receiving it into himself under this character. To conceive of Christ's redemption as having regard, either to all men numerically and outwardly considered, according to the Pelagian theory, or to a given number only in the same outward view, according to at least one kind of Calvinism, involves in the end the same error; this namely, that Christ did not really assume our human nature at all, in his Mediatorial life, but only stood on the outside of it, and wrought a work beyond it, in the semblance of our common manhood, for the benefit of such as are brought individually and separately to avail themselves of his grace. This is to make Christ a mere instrument or means, for the accomplishment of an end which is supposed to have its existence and necessity under a wholly different form; than which it is hard to conceive of anything more derogatory to the true dignity of his person. Gloriously above all this is the form under which he appears in the Gospel. He is himself there the Salvation of the world, not simply as a true mediation between heaven and earth is reached in his own life separately considered, but as this life also, on its human side, is found to be the comprehension in truth of Man's life as a whole, the actual lifting up of our fallen nature from the ruins of the fall, and its full investiture with all the glory and honor for which it was originally formed. Humanity, as a single universal fact, is redeemed in Christ, truly and really, without regard to other men, any farther than as they are made to partake of this redemption by being brought into living union with his person.

Archdeacon Wilberforce puts himself to some trouble, to show that there is such a thing as *human nature* objectively considered, in distinction from the mere thought or notion of a certain multitude of men regarded as having a common character.

“The objection brought against the actual existence of human nature is, that being only an abstraction formed by ourselves from a variety of examples, there can be no *real thing* intended by it; to give it actual existence is supposed to be the error of the Realists, who attributed an objective existence to those universal conceptions, which were only the creatures of their own minds. Hence, the reality of human nature, as a thing existing in the external world, is denied, because to assert reality for the idea of it in our own minds, would be contrary to the theory of Nominalism, which prevails in logic. But this is to abuse the principles of Nominalism on one side, as the opposite principle of Realism has been abused on the other. That many objects can be united by our classing them under a common idea, does not give them any real objective union; but neither does it take that union away, provided that by other means it can be shown to exist. Yet this is the argument of those who, on principles of Nominalism, deny the objective existence of human nature. They pass over the distinction between such classifications as men make for themselves by an inward act of reasoning, and such as have been provided in the external world by God's Providence. The one are only our own internal acts; the other have an external existence. The error of the Realists was encouraged, according to Archbishop Whately, by observation of those organized beings, which are bound together by the unalterable laws of nature. That in these cases there existed a real, though unknown bond, which maintained the perpetuity of the class, led men to attribute an objective existence to their own abstractions. But if no real connexion had united these external objects, the sight of them would not have led any one astray. When we class together philosophers or physicians, we bestow a common name upon those who are associated by their dispositions or employments. There is no connexion between them, distinct from the thoughts and actions to which the individuals described choose to addict themselves. There is a real similarity in their doings, supposing the class to be happily designated; but it is a similarity only, and at their will they may cease to resemble one another. It would be a vicious Realism, therefore, to assert the existence of an objective connexion among these parties, because we can embrace them under a common idea; but it would be an equally vicious Nominalism to deny an objective reality, where an inherent law prevents the possibility of such re-arrangement, and confines individuals to the peculiar classes to which they severally belong. The first would

be to claim for our own mind the power of making its inward ideas into external realities; the second would be to deny the existence of external realities, because we have not the power of making them. We have no right, therefore, to deny the existence of a common nature in those who are derived from a common origin; whose union does not depend upon their voluntary combination, and cannot be dissolved by their own will."—*P.* 48-50.

With some, all this may be set down as so much mysticism and transcendentalism. They go on the common sense view, which turns the world into a sand-heap. We agree however fully with Stahl, as quoted *p.* 52. "The more superficial a man is, the more isolated will every thing seem to him, for on the surface all things are detached. In mankind, in the nation, even in the family, he will see nothing but individuals, whose actions are altogether distinct. The deeper a man is, the more conscious will he be of those inward principles of unity, which radiate from the centre. Even the love of our neighbour is only a deep feeling of this unity, for a man does not love those to whom he does not perceive and feel himself bound. Unless sin could come through one, and through one atonement, there could be no understanding the command to love our neighbour."

Such a collective existence in the case of our race, not the aggregate of its individual lives but the underlying substance in which all these are one, is everywhere assumed in the Bible, as a fact entering into the whole history of religion. The race starts in Adam. It is recapitulated again, or gathered into a new centre and head, in Christ.

"This is the fact declared, when it is stated that Christ took man's nature: it implies the reality of a common humanity, and His perfect and entire entrance into its ranks. Thus did He assume a common relation to all mankind. This is why the existence of human nature is a thing too precious to be surrendered to the subtleties of logic, because upon its existence depends that real manhood of Christ which renders Him a co-partner with ourselves. And upon the reality of this fact is built that peculiar connexion between God and man, which is expressed by the term Mediation. It looks to an actual alteration in the condition of mankind, through the admission of a member into its ranks, in whom and through whom it attained an unprecedented elevation. Unless we discern this real impulse which was bestowed upon humanity, the doctrines of Atonement and Sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology. That 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' implies an actual acceptance of the

children of men, on account of the merits of one of their race ; as well as an actual change in the race itself through the entrance of its nobler associate. The work of man's redemption and renewal is a real work, performed by real agents. It is not only that the Almighty was pleased to save appearances, if we may so express it, by conceding to the representations of a third party, what He did not choose otherwise to yield or to acknowledge (as Queen Philippa prevailed over her harsher husband, Edward ;) but Christ's Incarnation was a step in the mighty purposes of the Most High, whereby all the relations of heaven and earth were truly affected. To deny, as is done by Bishop Hampden, 'that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done,' would be to resolve this real series of acts into a mere technical juggle. But to the reality of this work, the existence of that common nature is indispensable, whereby 'as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He Himself took part of the same.' Else, how would the perfect assumption of humanity have consisted with His retaining that divine personality, which it was impossible that He should surrender? Since it was no new person which He took, it can only have been the substratum in which personality has its existence. For His Incarnation was not the 'conversion of Godhead into flesh, but the taking of the manhood into God.' Or how could He have entered into a common relation to mankind in general, unless there had existed a common nature as the medium of union? This nature, which exists only in individual persons, He took for the earthly clothing of that divine personality, in which He must ever continue to exist."—*P.* 55-56.

The universalness of Christ's life does not consist in the assumption of the lives of all men into himself, but in the assumption of that living law or power, which, whether in Adam alone or in all his posterity, forms at once the entire fact of Humanity, irrespectively of the particular human existences in which it may appear. These are always a finite *All* ; the other is a boundless *Whole* ; two conceptions, which are as wide as the poles apart. Christ, in this view, is organically and historically joined, we say, with the universal life of Man, as its only true ground, and centre, and end. The child, it is sometimes said, is father to the man ; inasmuch as the first foreshadows the coming of the second ; although, in truth, that which is second here, when we look to inward reality, must be counted first. It is only in full manhood, that the tendencies and powers of childhood are made complete at last, through the actualization of their own sense. Analogous with this is the relation of our general human nature to the coming of Christ. It looks to this event from the beginning, as the proper completion of its own

meaning; and in such view may be regarded as opening the way for it in the order of time; although as regards the order of actual being the mystery of the incarnation must be considered first, as that which lies at the ground of our whole human life in its true form. Christ thus is the deepest sense, the most urgent want of humanity, as it stood previously to his coming, or still stands where his coming is not owned. The universal constitution of the world looks towards him as its necessary centre. All the lines of history converge towards him as their necessary end. He is the "desire of all nations," the dream of the Gentile as well as the hope of the Jew. If there be any wholeness in our human life whatever, any rational unity in history, and if the incarnation be at the same time a real putting on of humanity, a real entrance of the Word into the process of our existence, and not a mere Gnostic vision or Hindoo avatar instead, how is it possible to escape the truth of this proposition? Those who seek to cut off Christ from all organic, inwardly historical connection with the world in its natural form, as though his credit must be endangered by his being made to appear a true *birth* of mankind, the veritable *seed* of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head, know not surely what they are about. As an abstraction, in no natural union with the life of Man universally considered, how could his pretensions ever be legitimated or made sure?

III. The *Humanity* of Christ is the repository and medium of salvation for the rest of mankind. The truth of this proposition flows inevitably, from what has been already said of his Mediatorial nature, and its relation to the universal or whole life of the race. Christ has redeemed the world, or the nature of Man as fallen in Adam, by so taking it into union with his own higher nature as to deliver it from the curse and power of sin; meeting the usurpation of this false principle with firm resistance from the start; triumphantly repelling its assaults; and in the end leading captivity captive, by carrying his man's nature itself, through the portals of the resurrection, to the right hand of God in glory. The process holds primarily altogether in his own person. In his own person, however, as the Second Adam, the bearer and root of our whole human nature, now lifted thus into actual union with the Godhead, and so made answerable to its true idea, as we find this labored after by its whole creation from the beginning. Thus perfected, he has become the captain and author of salvation for others, Heb. ii. 10, v. 9; and through his glorification, the way is open for the Spirit to carry forward the work of Christianity in the hearts and lives of his people

John, vii. 39. Such is the order of the Creed; Manhood glorified first in Christ, then by the Spirit in the Church, which is his Body, the true fulness or completion of his life in the world. The beginning of the new creation then, the primary and original seat of our actual salvation, is the *Human Nature* of Christ; for this is the real ground and foundation of the universal conception of Humanity in its highest form, the central orb through relation to which only this can ever change its character from darkness to light. True, the power of Christ to save rests in his person as a whole and falls back specially on his Divinity; it is the life of the WORD which becomes the light of men. But it is this Life still only as it "comes into the world," and appears clothed in the habiliments of *flesh*; and so we say the Flesh of Christ, or the Word which has come in the Flesh, and not the Word out of the Flesh, is the door or fountain by which the whole grace of the Gospel comes to its revelation in the world. Starting in eternity, it finds here the only outlet for its entrance into time. As an accomplished fact upon the earth, in living union with Man's life, and not a mere decree or thought in the mind of God, the entire Gospel begins in Christ, and proclaims itself as something to be seen, felt and handled, (1 John, i. 1-3,) in the power of his true Man's nature. Whatever of power there is in Christ for salvation, it is lodged for the use of the world in his FLESH, as the necessary medium of communication with the human race, the one only bond of his brotherhood and fellowship with those he came to save. To imagine any saving union possible with Christ apart from his Flesh, aside from that glorified Humanity by which only his Mediation stands in real contact with the world, is virtually to deny the mystery of the Incarnation itself, by making it to be of no meaning or force. It is the mark of Antichrist, we are told 1 John iv. 1-3, to place the coming of Christ *out of the flesh*.

This idea meets us everywhere in the ancient Church. "The mixture of Christ's bodily substance with ours," says Hooker, is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of his flesh with ours they speak of, to signify what our very bodies, through mystical conjunction, receive from that vital efficiency which we know to be his; and from bodily mixtures they borrow divers similitudes, rather to declare the truth, than the manner of coherence between his sacred and the sanctified bodies of saints," *Eccles. Pol. V. 56, 9*. So with the Church of the Reformation, the sense of the same mystery, as set forth in the Creed, wrought powerfully on all sides. Luther's faith and zeal here are well known. Calvin, in his way, is no less strong.

With all his opposition to a crass Capernaitic view of Christ's flesh, he insists continually on the great idea, that the Christian Salvation starts from the Humanity of Christ in a real way, and that we participate in it only by entering really into the new order of life of which this is the fountain and seat. His language on this subject has been pronounced mystical and unmeaning; but it is so only for those who have become estranged, in their thinking, from the true and proper sense of the mystery with which it is concerned. In itself it is uncommonly lucid and clear, and admirably answerable to the form under which the subject meets us in the Gospel. The Word is the source of life; to recover man, this has entered into union with his nature by becoming flesh; *in which form alone*, Christ is now the author of salvation to all who believe in his name. "The very flesh in which he dwells is made to be vivific for us, that we may be nourished by it to immortality. I am the living head, he says, which came down from heaven; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world (John vi. 48, 51). In these words he teaches, not simply that he is Life, as the Everlasting Word descending to us from heaven, but that in thus descending he has infused this virtue also into the flesh with which he clothed himself, in order that life might flow over to us from it continually." Calvin speaks, of course, not of Christ's flesh materially considered, but of his real human nature, through which only it is possible for this same nature in other men to be raised from death to immortality. The vivification of humanity begins in *his* manhood. His flesh is truly thus *life-giving*, not as the origin of life, but as its necessary and only medium for our fallen race. The manhood of Christ is the reservoir or depositary in which all grace dwells first, (the Spirit without measure,) for the use of the whole world besides. "Christi caro instar fontis est divitis et inexhausti, quæ vitam a divinitate in seipsam scaturientem ad nos transfundit." It would be hard to express the same thought more beautifully, or more clearly, in the same compass.

"Any school," Wilberforce tells us, "which denies the humanity of the Mediator to be the medium through which divine gifts are communicated to mankind, (and such is the error of all Rationalists,) is theologically allied either to Nestorianism or to Deism, in which Nestorianism results."—*P.* 154.

IV. The participation of Christ's benefits, in the case of his people, turns on a *real communication with his human nature* in the way of life. This is the idea of the "mystical union;" which all evangelical christians are willing to admit; while they

are too prone however, in many cases, to make it of no force, by carefully excluding from it the very mystery from which it draws its name. Because it holds only through the Spirit or Holy Ghost, they will have it that it is altogether spiritual, in such sense as to have no relation to Christ's manhood whatever; pleasing themselves, under this name, with the fancy of a life union with Christ in his divine nature, as though this only might be regarded as the fountain of such high grace in a separate and independent view. But this would imply the very consequence from which they pretend to shrink, without reason, on the other side, an actual partnership of believers with Christ in the awful mystery of the incarnation itself; for what less is it, if every single christian be joined in the way of real life directly with the Word absolutely taken, and not with the Word only *through* the flesh which it has already assumed in Christ. There is but one Incarnation, (*one* Mediator between God and man, the *Man* Christ Jesus,) but he is of such constitution, carrying our universal nature in his person, that all men may be joined with God also through him, by receiving into themselves the power of his life. This implies in their case no hyposatistical union with Deity, no new theanthropy in the sense of Christ's person; but just the reverse; since the only medium of union with the Godhead is Christ's manhood, as something that must necessarily intervene between the Divine Word and all other men.

The law of such relation is by no means confined to this case; but finds analogies and exemplifications throughout the universal economy of our life; only we have here the absolute truth of what in all other cases comes before us relatively only and in the way of remote approximation. Men never stand separately, and with fully co-ordinate personality, in the union of society; but always in organic groups that cluster around some common centre, and find support in this as the bond or medium of communion with a life that is higher and more general than their own. Every *hero*, in the broad sense of this word as denoting one who is qualified and called to go before others in the mission of Humanity, stands actually between those who follow him and the superior world from which this mission proceeds; he is for them the real organ of its revelation; and through him, at the same time, they gain strength and power to master it as their own, although without such central support this would be wholly impossible. In this case the personality of every follower is completed, like that of the leader himself, by union with the higher life which fills his soul; but this only, let it be observed, not by taking his place as the primary organ of such communi-

cation, but by acknowledging rather his central position, and leaning upon him as the necessary medium of the benefit thus gained. Such is the universal law of our life. And what does it teach? Clearly this, that our human personality can never become absolutely complete, till it comes to be joined in a real way at last with the life of God itself, which alone needs no ground beyond itself; and that such conjunction requires, (not a general deification of the race as the Hegelians dream,) but a Central Person, in whom Divinity may be actually united with Humanity, and who may be qualified thus to communicate the fellowship of the "divine nature" mediately to all who trust in his name. This is just the mystery which meets us in Christ. In him alone among men dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and we are complete in him, as the head of all principality and power (Col. ii. 9, 10). Christ's person is the bearer of our persons. We are complete, as regards intelligence and will, only as we live not by and from ourselves, but through faith in him, as the centre and end of our whole existence.

There is no room then to object to the idea of the mystical union as now stated, that it implies a continuation of the hypostatical mystery over into the life of the Church. The ancients do indeed speak at times of our being deified in Christ, as sharers of his nature; but they mean not by this, of course, any deification aside from Christ himself. Through the medium of his humanity, it is the privilege of believers, without losing their own separate individuality, to fall in on the fulness of his person as the true central ground of their own lives, and thus to participate in the grace of which he alone is the repository and fountain, and which is accessible to others only as they are joined to him in this way.

"The union of mankind with Christ is not a mere imitation—the following a good model—the fixing our thoughts upon One who has shown in the clearest manner, how God may be served and men benefitted—it is an actual and real union, whereby all renewed men are joined to the second, as they were by nature to the first Adam. This union cannot be explained away in the kingdom of grace, unless it is first explained away in the kingdom of nature. Unless 'sin standeth' only 'in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk' holiness must involve not the mere imitation, but the putting on, of the man Christ Jesus. By what means the relation is maintained, is in each case an inexplicable mystery; the natural alliance which takes place by descent being not less wonderful than that supernatural alliance which is brought by the regeneration. To analyze the law of family affinity is as much be-

yond our powers, as to understand how 'as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' The first is that transmission of the nature of our common ancestor which causes us to be what we are; the second is that spiritual Presence of the manhood of Christ, by union with which we become what it is given to us to be. The one of these is in Holy Writ set against the other, 'for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' As the one has its influence both on soul and body, so has the other." —P. 229-230.

V. As the medium of such living grace the *Human Nature* of Christ, and not simply his Divinity, is actively *present* always in the world. The Mediation of the Saviour, since his Ascension, holds towards God in his Intercession, while towards man it may be summed up in the single term of his *Presence*. This was his great promise, on going away: "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." The promise plainly regards the restoration of what was about to be lost, the presence of our Lord, namely, according to his human nature; only under a new and higher form. In this view, it is a spiritual and not a carnal presence; a presence accomplished not in the way of place and material contact, but by the intervention of the Holy Ghost; while however, as regards efficiency and force, it is not for this reason less real, but rather we may say more real, than it could be in any other way. On this subject take the following extract.

"Neither is this Presence merely that He is an object to men's thoughts, as Jerusalem was present to David from the land of Hermon. The reality of Christ's presence depends on Himself, not on those He visits. It had been an unmeaning promise to His disciples, that His Presence should return to them through the power of the Holy Ghost, had He designed only that through the exertion of their mental faculties they might think of Him who was departed. In this sense how is Christ present more than any Angel in light? We are speaking not of men's actings towards Him, but of His actings towards them, since His Ascension into heaven. As He acts *for* them by intercession with the Father, so are we assured that He acts *towards* them by His Presence with power. What is meant by His office as Mediator, unless through the annexation of the Divine to the Human nature, the latter has in itself some real influence independently of our thoughts? And this is the answer to the assertion, that since a body must either be present in any place, or not present in it, therefore Christ's body must either be materially present in the consecrated elements at the Holy Eucharist, or that we must allow that His Presence is merely figura-

tive. Doubtless it were so, if His body were a human body alone ; but because He is Divine also, it has likewise that other medium of communication which does not depend upon local contiguity, but upon spiritual power. Even the sun, because its influence is more wide than its actual limits, while it is at rest in its place in the sky, is present upon earth by the effluence of its beams. But that Sacred Manhood which was created for the service of the Mediator between God and men, in which were stored up the 'treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' that from it 'grace and truth' might flow forth into the whole race of man, has a real medium of presence through the Deity which is joined to it: so that it can be in all places and with all persons—not figuratively, but in truth—not by material contact, but by spiritual power. And while its material place is among the armies of heaven, its spiritual presence is among the inhabitants of the earth, when, how, and wheresoever is pleasing to its own gracious will."—P. 221-222.

The Mediation of Christ, then, is not something past and gone, nor yet something that lies wholly beyond the actual order of the world, with which we are to communicate only in the way of memory or thought ; it lives always, with perennial force, in the actual Presence of Christ's Manhood in the world. This thought reigns throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews. His *one* sacrifice is once for all, not as a transient event, but as an ever during fact in the power of his indissoluble Mediatorial life. His intercession is going forward *now* in real union with the daily course of the world, as truly as the sun enters into the same economy from day to day. "Our Lord's acts of Mediation towards men, as well as his Intercession with the Father, are a present fact in the world of life, and not a mere fictitious representation. To be accounted the bond of union between different natures is to discharge the part of a Mediator ; to be their real bond of union is to *be* one. Christ did not undertake this office as a legal fiction ; he is the 'One Mediator,' because in him Godhead and Manhood were really united. And if he has still the same character, it must be in fact and not in name—Godhead and Manhood must still be connected by his actual intervention. While he is one by nature with the Everlasting Father, he must be one also by grace with those inferior members to whom he has vouchsafed to become Head, that he might be the 'Saviour of the body.' For the gifts of grace do not become less necessary through the lapse of ages : every generation of Adam's children has equal need of that external principle of supernatural renewal, which flows from the humanity of the Son of God into his brethren. The acts of his human, must

continue therefore as certainly as those of his Divine nature, and consequently that Presence of his manhood, whereby 'we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.'—If Christ be still Mediator, there must be the perpetual presence among us of his man's nature, whereby he who is one with the Father becomes one also with his brethren."—*P.* 238–239. To separate the action of Christ in the world now from his man's nature, and to refer it only to his Divinity, is just to say that he no longer *acts* as a man at all, in other words *is* no longer really man, as in the days of humiliation. "And what then must be thought of that body which suffered on the Cross, but that either it was a created substance, invested by God's mercy with more than mortal power and goodness, that it might accomplish that sacrifice which was needed for mankind—which is the Arian hypothesis; or else that the Father of all displayed himself in man's form by a transient and occasional manifestation, and (that work being over) has again retreated into the abyss of his unapproachable Godhead"—which is the more subtle heresy of Sabellius. The Incarnation cannot be held as real, if the being and working of the Mediator in the world be not apprehended as the presence in it still of the living power of his true Human Life. This should be plain to all.

VI. Christ's Presence in the world is in and by his mystical body, the *Church*. As a real human presence, carrying in itself the power of a new life for the race in general, it is no abstraction or object of thought merely, but a glorious living Reality, continuously at work, in an organic and historical way, in the world's constitution. Christ communicates himself to his people, and lives in them, not by isolated favor in each case, but collectively. His relation is at once to the whole family of the redeemed, and single christians accordingly have part in him only as they are comprehended at the same time in this whole. To be in Christ, is to be a member also necessarily of his mystical body, as dependence on a natural centre implies comprehension in the universal orb or sphere holding in the same relation. This is the idea of the Church. It comes from within and not from without. It grows out of the mystery of the Incarnation, apprehended as an abiding fact, and comes before us in the Creed accordingly, not as a notion or speculation merely, but as an article of *faith*. So too it has its attributes from itself and not from abroad. It is by an *a priori* necessity, it claims to be one, holy, and catholic. To deny or question this necessity is at once a heresy, which strikes in the end at the very foundation of Christianity itself. "That the Church is one body results

from organization, not from enactment," much less from human policy and agreement. "Neither is the profession of the Church's unity the mere admission of an external appearance, but the belief of an inward verity;" facts may or may not accord with it at any given time, but it still remains unalterably certain in its own nature, until Christianity itself be found to be false. Christ's *one* mediation, as related to men and reaching them through his glorified humanity, always present for this purpose in the world by the Spirit, is carried forward through the intervention of the Church, his Body Mystical, the fulness of what he is otherwise by distinction only in its single members. The Church, in this view, does indeed stand between Christ and the believer, but only as the body of a living man is between one of his limbs and the living soul by which it is quickened and moved.

VII. The idea of the Church, as thus standing between Christ and single christians, implies of necessity visible *organization*, common *worship*, a regular public *ministry* and *ritual*, and to crown all especially grace-bearing *sacraments*. To question this, is to give up to the same extent the sense of Christ's Mediation as a perennial fact, now and always taking effect upon the economy of the world through the Church as his mystical body. Let it be felt that the Incarnation is a mystery not simply past, and not simply beyond the world, but at this time in full force for the world, carrying in itself the whole value of Christ's sacrifice and resurrection as an undying "ONCE FOR ALL"—the true conception of the Mediatorial Supremacy, as the real headship of Christ's manhood over all in behalf of the Church and for its salvation; let it be felt, at the same time, that this mystery touches men in and by the Church, which itself is made to challenge their faith for this reason as something supernatural and divine; and it becomes at once impossible to resist the feeling, that the "powers of the world to come" are actually at hand in its functions and services, with the same objective reality that attaches to the powers of nature under their own form and in their own place. To see no more in the ministry and offices of the Church, in this view, than a power of mere outward declaration and testimony, such as we might have in any secular school, betrays a rationalistic habit of mind, which only needs to be set free from the indolence of uninquiring tradition, that it may be led to deny altogether that Christ has ever or at all come in the flesh.

It sounds well, and falls in well too with *natural* reason and popular sense, to magnify what is called spiritual religion as compared with a religion of outward ordinances and forms, and

to make Christianity turn on individual exercises transacted directly with God, in the sanctuary of the mind, aside from all regard to sacramental or other intervening media. But it ought to be borne in mind, that Christianity is not mere nature, and that to throw ourselves here on simply natural conceptions and impulses is in truth to substitute for it another theory of religion altogether. It comes to us as a system of redemption and salvation by a Mediator. It is throughout a mediatorial economy. The grace it reveals, is offered in Christ, not from a different quarter. It is offered in Christ again as Man; by the intervention of his flesh; through the door of his humanity, in the most real and true way. Under this form it is not something to be thought of merely, with however much devotion, on the part of the believer; the case calls for an actual participation in its life and power. Christianity is so constituted accordingly as to be dependent always on means, which have for their object this union and communion in a real way. Salvation in these circumstances is still a personal and inward or spiritual interest; *mere* relations and forms save no man; but it is made to hang on the medium of a special economy in the Church as the mystical body of Christ, serving to bind the subject in living union with his natural flesh or humanity; which is embraced and rested upon by faith accordingly for this purpose. Not to acknowledge this, but to insist on having access to God independently of any such special economy, by virtue simply of the relation in which all souls stand to him as the "Father of the spirits of all flesh," is not Christianity but Rationalism under the christian name.

"To assert the truth of Christ's presence—the reality of that union which binds the whole mystic body of His Church to the manhood of the Incarnate Word—is to maintain the reality of His Mediation, and the absolute necessity of that bond by which heaven and earth are united. For it is a necessary result of the cardinal truth of the Christian system—the truth, *i. e.*, that all gifts and blessings are introduced into our race through the intervention of that nobler member, who connects it with the Almighty. And herein is the Christian scheme of Mediation opposed to that theory of Rationalism, which rests upon the capacities of nature. The principle of Rationalism is, that man's improvement may be effected through those gifts which God bestowed upon him by creation, inasmuch as sufficient means of intercourse with the Supreme Spirit were provided by the law of his nature. Whereas the Church deals with man as a fallen race, whose original means of intercourse with God have been obstructed, and which needs a new and supernatural channel for the entrance of heavenly gifts. And this chan-

nel has been provided through the Man Jesus Christ. In His person did Godhead enter manhood, that through this one perfect type of humanity, it might 'leaven the whole lump.' Thus does the law of grace supersede the law of nature. If man had never fallen, to inherit the nature of the first Adam had been a sufficient means of communion with God. But because the natural means of communication have been cut off, that supernatural union is requisite which we obtain by participating the nature of the second Adam. Now, it is for the diffusion of this renewed and renewing manhood, that those media have been provided, whereby the Son of Man communicates Himself to His brethren. All the ordinances of the Church, its hallowed things, places, and persons—its worship and sacraments—are a series of instruments whereby the sanctified manhood of the Mediator diffuses itself as a life-giving seed through the mass of humanity. Thus does He continue to effect that work through His man's nature, which He avowed to be the very object of His earthly being: 'For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' And for this office are external media as requisite, as were body and limbs to the truth of His human being. As He could not be a man without that substantial existence which revealed Him to the senses of mankind, so He could not be the Head of the Body Mystical, without the use of those actual media of intercourse, whereby He unites His living members to Himself."—*P.* 249-251.

There is no opposition between Christ and the Church, or between individual piety on the one hand and sacramental grace on the other; but just the reverse. Christ becomes full only in and by the Church; and personal experience is made solid and real, only as it rests on grace offered and appropriated from abroad. "To maintain that the outward means of grace, whereby we are united to the manhood of Christ, are not less necessary than those emotions of our own which have their seat within, is not to put the Church instead of Christ, but to protest against men's putting themselves in the place of their Redeemer. To speak of inward seriousness as necessary, is only to testify the truth of each man's separate responsibility; but to speak of it as superseding outward means, is to do away with the office of the 'One Mediator.' The individual life of each man's spirit, as opposed to the carelessness of a thoughtless walk, is the very treading down of Satan under our feet; but to contrast it with the value of Gospel ordinances, is to deny Christ, to depose him from his office of a Mediator, and to set up idols of intercession in our own hearts."—*P.* 270.

With this view of the significance of christian worship generally, the peculiar sense and power of the holy sacraments are

apprehended as a necessary consequence, the rejection of which must do violence to the whole Creed. They are "not only badges of profession" but also "certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace." They exhibit objectively the realities they represent. So we have it asserted very distinctly in the New Testament. Such was the faith, from the beginning, of the universal ancient Church. Such also is the original Protestant faith, as held by the two great confessions, Lutheran and Reformed, on the Continent, as well as by the Episcopal Church in England. Our author closes his view of this subject with the following paragraph, which we commend specially to the consideration of all *evangelical* skeptics, who make a merit of sneering at the idea of sacramental grace, whether in the case of baptism or in the case of the Lord's supper, as though it were the same thing with the "*opus operatum*" itself in the worst sense of Rome.

"It remains only to recall that which has been already stated, as applicable to both the sacred ordinances which have been considered. The reality of both of them has been maintained: it has been affirmed that Baptism is not merely the expression of a charitable hope; that the Lord's supper is not a bare act of pious recollection. The essential principle of each of them has been shown to be union with the perfect manhood of Christ Our Lord. Let it be remembered only in conclusion, that to deny their reality is to assail the great principle of the Mediation of Christ. For the Doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation does not rest only on the Divine power of Christ, as a partaker in the nature of self-existent Godhead; it implies also that, by associating man's nature to His own, He has made created being the channel of His gifts. Now, as the media through which these gifts are dispensed to His brethren; as the ramifications, whereby His Divine nature distributes itself on the right hand and the left, these two Sacraments go together—their importance is equal—their effect alike—and to disparage them is to derogate from that principle of action which the wisdom of God has seen fitting to adopt. Every attempt to explain them away, every contrivance for extenuating the real import of what they effect, is a virtual detracting from the reality of that objective and actual influence, which Christ the Mediator is pleased to exert. Its tendency is to resolve His actions into a metaphor, and His existence into a figure of speech. His specific and personal agency as the Eternal Son, who in the fulness of time conjoined Himself to man's nature for the recovery of a fallen race, is merged in the general action of that ultimate Spirit, whom none but Atheists professedly reject. For the real objection against the Sacramental system does not arise from any deficiency in its Scriptural authority,

which has been shown to be ample, but from the abstract improbability that external ordinances can be the means of obtaining internal gifts. Now, this improbability rests on the circumstance that the *natural* mean of connexion with God is the intercourse of mind with mind, and consequently that the intercourse through Sacraments is *supernatural*. The connexion with God, *i. e.* which man received by creation, and which Rationalism affirms to be sufficient for his wants, is more compatible with men's natural position, than that new system of Mediation which has been revealed in the Gospel. But let the doctrine of mediation be admitted, and it ceases to be an argument against the Sacramental system that it does not accord with that scheme of nature, which the Gospel professes to supersede. And the Rationalistic argument against these means of grace, is of equal avail against that whole scheme of Mediation upon which they are dependent. If the natural intercourse of mind with the unembodied mind of the Creator supersedes the necessity of Sacramental ordinances, does it not supersede equally the humanity of Christ? If man has still that immediate communion with God, of which Scripture affirms that the Fall deprived him, what need is there of a Mediator between them? Thus does the objection mount up from earth to heaven—from Christ feeding men below through Sacraments, to Christ mediating above by His Atonement and Intercession. For 'if we have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if we tell you of heavenly things?' If the Sacraments be thus emptied of their meaning, it is because the present actings of Christ as the Son of Man are not appreciated; and the purposes of His Incarnation are forgotten. And this forgetfulness again may be traced to unbelief in that real diversity of Persons in the Blessed Trinity, in which all creaturely existence has its ultimate root. Thus does a practical Sabellianism respecting Christ's Person coincide with that Rationalistic theory, by which the reality of His Sacraments is disputed. And their surrender is fatal to the true Doctrine concerning Himself, even as the true doctrine of His nature sets the importance of these instruments in a proper light."—P. 346-348.

Archdeacon Wilberforce is of course a High Churchman, and his whole work is designed to be in favor of Episcopacy as established in the Church of England. At the same time however, he knows very well how to distinguish between the form of Christianity in this view and its true interior life and substance. There are two sorts of high churchmanship. One starts with a certain system of outward order, as though it were the first thing, the main thing, settled and sure by divine appointment in and of itself, and made to inclose thus externally all truth besides as its necessary boundary and hedge. In this way, too often, we

find Episcopalians laying all stress on their favorite system, as of divine right and obligation apart from its own contents altogether; as though Christ had been pleased to provide by such an outward institute in the first place for the safe-keeping of his truth and grace, and it were possible now by simply historical evidence, or in the way of ecclesiastical tradition, to make sure of this always as the necessary condition and medium of reaching what lies beyond. Episcopacy, with this way of thinking, is taken to be the primary interest of Christianity, an indispensable stepping stone at least, or threshold, to all that constitutes its interior sanctuary. It is to be accepted first as the necessary inclosure and platform of the Church. Vast pains are taken to establish its claims in this abstract view, on grounds and reasons that have nothing to do whatever with the inward constitution of Christianity itself; and vast affectation follows, in parading such merely outward prerogative as a substitute for everything else, and a sufficient apology for overlooking and despising all earnest thought under a different form. This is pedantry, and so far as it prevails tends naturally and of right to bring the Church theory, with which it is associated, into discredit and contempt. But there is another way of holding and asserting the claims of the Church. It is to begin, not with the circumference of Christianity, but with its centre, the mystery of the Incarnation as we find it set forth in the Creed, and so to proceed to what flows from this for faith by necessary consequence and derivation. In this way the *idea* of the Church comes first; and what its actualization may be found to comprehend subsequently, is apprehended and accepted in such living inward connection, not as something external to the proper christian life, but as the very form and expression of this life itself. It is in this order, that Archdeacon Wilberforce presses the claims of his subject. He sees the danger of substituting the Church as a formal system in place of its Head, and finds the only right security against it in the sense of their inward relation to each other as it springs from the christological fact itself.

“So long as the Church is regarded as an external system, based on certain laws and administered by certain leaders, it can never fail to enlist a measure of that party spirit which belongs to man's nature, and thus to draw away attention from the holy purposes for which it was instituted. The only safeguard against this danger is the due subordination of its external frame-work to its internal principle; and the constant recognition that its life depends, not on the gifts of government, but on the gifts of grace. If the es-

sence of the Church's existence be that certain men have a right to rule, and teach, and minister, whether they be chosen by the free voice of the congregation, imposed by government, or delegated by the Apostles, there is such large opening for cabal and dispute, that love and peace and Christ's presence will soon be lost in the din of party strife. The Presbyterian platform offers as good footing to the spirit of partisanship as the system of Episcopacy; and the Pilgrim Fathers of Massachusetts were as ready to persecute as Boniface or Hildebrand. But let the essence of the Church's existence be felt to be Christ's presence—let it be remembered that His manhood is the true seed of the renewed race, and that through spiritual presence it bestows its life-giving power on all the members of His mystic body—let every other question be dependent upon these—let them take their place, as of subordinate importance, and as merely contributing to this great result—and what room is there for discord between Christ and the Church, when the Church is Christ Himself manifest in His mystic body? 'For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church.' The theorist may be unvisited by the sun's warmth while he discusses its nature, or the poet while he describes its brilliancy; but how can we loose sight of his glorious beams by going forth to walk in the sunshine? And so long as this Divine principle is kept fully in view, it can hardly fail to soften and elevate those whom it influences. So that if the harshness of party-spirit be not cured, it may at least be abated."—*P.* 268-269.

High Churchmanship, in this view, is everywhere entitled to respect. The Creed owns it in distinct terms, and it meets us from all sides in the faith of the early Church; to such an extent indeed that without it there can be no power to understand or appreciate this faith fully in any direction. The inferences which some feel authorised to draw from the idea of the Church in favor of Episcopacy, or farther still in favor of Romanism, are another thing. We have nothing to do with them here, in the way either of favor or opposition. They are at all events not what can be considered first and foremost, either as to evidence or importance, in this great question of the Church. There is a wide field of theological truth beyond them, and back of them in the order of faith, which it is quite possible for us to enter and possess intelligently before coming to their settlement and resolution at all, and which indeed we *must* possess with such preliminary occupation, in order to be at all qualified for this secondary work. For what is a man's faith worth in Episcopacy for instance, as a divine institution, who has not in the first place, as the root and ground of this a firm faith in the idea of "one, holy, catholic Church" as necessarily flowing from the

idea of the Incarnation, and whose mind is not led from this centre out to the other supposed necessary peripheral interest of Christianity, rather than in the reverse order from what is the circumference merely to the centre? And so on the other hand what is a man's rejection of Episcopacy worth, or his rejection we may add of Romanism itself, if it be not supported from behind by any true acknowledgment of the mystery of Christ and his Church, as we find it proclaimed from the beginning in the universal christian Creed? A controversy about Episcopacy between those who have not in their minds the sense of the Church as a divine mystery in the world, under the form of an *a priori* necessity starting in Christ, must ever be a waste of words more or less, on both sides. As such an *a priori* object of faith, then, the idea of the Church offers wide scope for contemplation and inquiry back of this controversy altogether; and in the circumstances of the present time especially, it is of the utmost account that this preliminary ground should be properly regarded and fairly taken into use under its separate character, without embarrassment from any such relations, which after all are of secondary rather than primary account, and even if taken in this view to be absolutely necessary, must still be held to be so in the way of derivation only from what goes before and not as its ground and cause. We like this book of Wilberforce on this account. However much it may aim to serve the cause of Episcopacy, that is not made the front at all of its argument. It starts with the beginning, and not with what at best should be counted only as the end. It plants itself on deeper ground, and throws itself back on the substance of Christianity as something older than Episcopacy, something that must of necessity underlie all its pretensions and claims, if they are to be found in any case worthy of respect. It is an argument for the idea of the Church, as founded on the glorious mystery of the Word made flesh and its perennial force in the world, which all who call themselves christians are bound to own and confess, whether such acknowledgment be felt to involve Episcopal conclusions or not. We may resist these, if it seem fit, and yet allow in full the force of what is involved in the idea of the Church as their supposed foundation. The inquiry here offered to our view, though in Episcopal hands, belongs in truth to Christianity in its most comprehensive character and form; all denominations, that have not formally or informally renounced the Apostles' Creed, may meet here as on common territory; for the question of the Church, as an article of faith, is one in which they are all alike bound to take interest, whatever may be their difference of view in regard to the outward form and order of the Church.

This deserves to be well understood and considered. The question with which we are first concerned in this great case, has nothing to do directly with Episcopacy or any other outward constitution as such ; it regards the being of the Church, and its primary attributes, as an article of faith, in the sense of the ancient world. Is the faith of the ancient Church on this subject, as we find it uttered among the supposed fundamentals of the Creed, to be accepted as something still in force, or is it to be rejected as an empty dream and idle superstition ? Is the Holy Catholic Church, as it once filled the soul of Christendom, a "figment," or is it still as in the beginning a divine fact on which men are required to lean as the very "pillar and ground of the truth" that starts in Christ ? The misery of much of our modern religion is, not just that it differs from this or that particular form of church life, which may be supposed to have distinguished the early Church, but that the Church itself is taken to be a wholly different thing. It is notorious that the Church, according to the universal sense of the ancient christian world, was held to be the repository actually of superhuman powers among men, the medium not metaphorically but really and truly of grace lodged in its very constitution, from Christ its head, for the salvation of sinners. In such view only was it regarded as an object of *faith*. It was identified with the idea of Christ's Mediation, as a perennial fact in the world. The foundation of the christian life was held to be objectively at hand in its institutions, for the use of all who might lay hold of it by their means. Prophetical and priestly functions were felt to belong to it, as the Body of Christ. Its sacraments were regarded as vehicles, by the Spirit, of the high and solemn realities they were framed to represent. The idea of a mystical supernatural force going along with the activity of the Church, was acknowledged in every sort of way on all sides. All this is notorious ; and it is just as notorious, on the other hand, that for much of our modern evangelical thinking this whole conception of the Church has gone entirely out of authority and date. A painful chasm holds here between much of our modern religious habit and the religion of the ancient Church. It becomes accordingly a great question, and the *first* we need to settle in relation to ecclesiastical order, (without clear and full answer to which it is vain to agitate any other questions in regard to it,) whether in this issue the ancient faith, or the modern variation now noticed, is to be taken as the true sense of Christianity. Church or No-church ; that is the point which first requires to be settled. And to do this, it is not necessary to proceed empirically, or in other words to be ruled by mere out-

ward observation. Back of all *Lo here*, or *Lo there*, in this case, is the necessary constitution of the Church itself as an article, not of sight, but of faith. That starts in Christ; and according to the view we have of Christ, in the end, will be and must be our view also of the Church. We come to the true conception of the Church through a true and sound Christology, (as in the Creed,) and in no other way.

J. W. N.

MEMORIALS OF JOHN BARTRAM AND HUMPHRY MARSHALL.

Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall. By William Darlington, M. D., L. L. D. etc., with illustrations.—pp. 585. Lindsay and Blakiston, Philadelphia.—1849.

To rescue from oblivion the existing memorials of John Bartram, founder of the celebrated garden, near Philadelphia, which bears his name, and Humphry Marshall, author of the "*Arbustum Americanum*," the first treatise on plants ever written and published by an American,—men of Quaker descent and of native Pennsylvanian growth, who, while our country was yet new and filled with hostile savage tribes, while the study of Natural History, even in Europe, was yet in its infancy, before the star of Linnæus had risen to its full height, with no advantages of education beyond those afforded by the common school, which, at that day, must have been few indeed, and without the aids of fortune, led by natural taste, ventured forth into the wilderness, to explore and gather the vegetable treasures of so vast a region, travelling by manifold journeys, unprotected amid a thousand dangers, along the whole eastern slope of the Alleghenies, from the shores of the St. Lawrence to the swamps and everglades of Florida,—was a task that no one could execute half so well as the learned editor of the "*Reliquiæ Baldwinianæ*." He deserves the hearty thanks of "the lovers of Botany, on both sides of the Atlantic," to whom he has been pleased to dedicate this superb volume.

The value of the work is greatly enhanced by an article on the progress of the Science on this continent, judicious notes, and biographical sketches of Bartram, Marshall, and their botanical contemporaries. But it owes its bulk to letters to and from distinguished naturalists and philosophers at home and abroad,

among whom were Linnæus, Franklin, Logan, Clayton, Catesby, Gronovius, Sir Hans Sloane, Fothergill, Miller and Dillenius.

Bartram's chief correspondent, however, was Peter Collinson, a wealthy merchant of London, and a member of the Society of Friends. His memory is well preserved in the beautiful genus *Collinsonia*. The letters, which passed between them, during a period of thirty-four years, from 1734 to 1768, by reason of the absence of scientific terms, the quaint simplicity of the style, the honest enthusiasm everywhere manifest, and the frequent allusion to interesting political events of the time, must charm any one, who has even but a general knowledge of our indigenous plants and animals.

To the editor, eminently fitted, as he is, by long and thorough acquaintance with the Flora of the Atlantic States, north and south, it must have been a rare pleasure to trace out and identify the plants, described by Bartram in common language, and known to him mostly by their vulgar names. We coincide with his decisions in all cases, save two, where he seems himself to have been in doubt.

The "waggish *Tipitiwitchet* Sensitive," which made the Frenchman "ready to burst with laughter" (p. 243), and was so highly esteemed by Friend Peter, that he would spare Linnæus only a *single leaf*, as he says (p. 251): "O, Botany, delightfulest of all sciences! There is no end of thy gratifications. All botanists will join with me in thanking my dear John, for his unwearied pains to gratify every inquisitive genius. I have sent Linnæus a specimen and *one leaf* of *Tipitiwitchet* Sensitive: only to him would I spare such a jewel. Pray send more specimens. I am afraid we can never raise it. Linnæus will be in raptures at the sight of it—"this pretty *Tipitiwitchet*," alluded to also on pages 241, 245, 248, 249, and 275, cannot be the *Schrankia uncinata*, Willd., as may be seen at once by comparing Claytons two letters on pages 408 and 411. In the first he writes, "I intend sending you some seeds of *our thoray Sensitive Plant* (*Schrankia*?)" (most probably the *Schrankia uncinata*, Willd., which grows in Southern Virginia, where Clayton resided), and in the second, "I should be glad of a little seed of the *Carolina Tipitiwitchet* or Sensitive Plant. I dare say, my friend Mr. Franklin would be kind enough to frank a small parcel of seeds from you to him." The *Tipitiwitchet* was not, then, found in Virginia, but came from Carolina, and accords so well with the *Dionæa muscipula*, Ellis, that we cannot help thinking it must be the plant meant. John Bartram had a brother living at Cape Fear, N. C., in the midst of the circumscribed

locality of the *Dionæa*, and his son William, ten years after Collinson received the Tipitiwitchet, bears the following testimony: "Observed likewise in these Savannahs' abundance of the ludicrous *Dionæa muscipula* (Dionæa, Ellis. epis. ad Linnæum, miraculum naturæ, folia biloba, radicalia, ciliata, conduplicanda, sensibilia, insecta incarcerationia.—Syst. vegetab. p. 335). This wonderful plant seems to be distinguished in the creation, by the Author of nature, with faculties eminently superior to every other vegetable production; specimens of it were first communicated to the curious of the old world by John Bartram, the American botanist and traveller, who contributed as much, if not more, than any other man towards enriching the North American botanical nomenclature, as well as its natural history."—(Travels, p. 470).

The other case in which we differ from the worthy editor occurs on page 422, in a letter from John Bartram to Moses or William Bartram, at Cape Fear, N. C.—"Next day he lent me his horse to ride over the Congaree, seventy miles, to Georgia. In this ride, I found a wonderful variety of rare plants and shrubs, particularly a glorious evergreen, about four or five feet high, and much branched, in very small twigs growing upright. The leaves are much like the Newfoundland Spruce, rather smaller, and grow around the twigs close, like it. The seed is very small in little capsules, as big as mustard (*Cyrilla racemiflora*, L.?) Now *Cyrilla racemiflora*, L. has lanceolate leaves, and was known to Bartram as the "plumed Andromeda" (v. p. 549). Without doubt, this "glorious evergreen," should not be set down as *Cyrilla racemiflora*, L., but certainly as *Ceratiola ericoides*, Willd., which abounds on the hills north of Augusta, Ga., the point where Bartram would be most likely to strike the Savannah, and agrees precisely with his graphic description.

Reluctantly do we close our brief notice of this entertaining volume, which in every way reflects honor on the State, and hope that the author will continue his labors in this field of history and record the bloodless triumphs of other men of science, who have lived and died within our borders.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

¹ Savannahs just south of Wilmington, N. C.

ISLE ROYALE.

[At a time, a few years since when the Copper fever had reached the crisis of delirium, happened the truthful incident recorded in the following lines. A 'company' had secured a 'location' on the southern shore of Isle Royale in Lake Superior. In order to maintain a Squatter's claim to their territory,—the lands being then, as they yet are, governmental possessions,—a hut was reared upon the premises, and a man, Charles Mott by name, together with his wife, Angelica, carried thither and left. Stores were supplied thought to be quite sufficient for the ample maintenance, through the long winter at hand, of the solitary two; but the event proved otherwise. The Island, full of loveliness as it is, is all loneliness. Of birds, away from those of prey, and water fowl, there are almost none, save of one species, about the size of a sparrow, and of a voice, that is singing day long and all night, clear as a lark's, and musical as a nightingale's; but they abound. The miners call this bird the Pe-dee. Of beasts a stray fox, or a deer, travelled perilously on the ice from the Canada Shore, are only ever seen, and that rarely. Unable, consequently, when their provisions were exhausted, to have them renewed by such resource, the Squatter and his wife were driven to the worst extremity of destitution. The earlier life and habits of the latter, (she was Indian-born, and forest-bred,) qualified her for sterner endurance than the other, and she yet lives at the Saut Ste. Marie to testify of that time, and of its trials.]

By the fair heaven it is a sight
That thrills one's soul to see!
Oh, laughing lake! oh, leaping light
Oh, crystal sky, and pearly tide,
Where sunshine seems a curtain, thrown
Abroad the sea and air, to hide
Some purer lustre not its own!
Where cliff and crag with clouded brow,
Upon the dancing waves below,
Look stern and frowningly;
And sombre pines, thick clustering,
Abroad their veiling shadows fling,
Mellowing the gleam to softer hue,
They seek, but vainly, to subdue!
Oh, for a home mid such a scene
Of wilderness and evergreen!

Where limped streams with silvery song
 Speed music as they trip along ;
 Where sparkling dews from dawn to dawn
 Unwasting, pearl the jewelled lawn ;
 Where wet with mists they latest drank,
 Gay-tinted flowers illume the bank,
 And mosses throw their fettered links
 O'er rocky juts and water-brinks !

Sure skill of elf or fay ne'er wrought
 The dream-work of a lovelier spot !—

"Aye, gentle sir, 'twere sooth you say,
 Did sunshine rule each changing day :
 But winter clouds fill summer skies,
 And fair winds fall when gales arise."

It was the *Voyageur* that spoke,
 As, pausing mid the paddle-stroke
 He leaned upon his oar.

"Now, mark," quoth he, "while I would tell,
 Of what in yonder glade befell,

Hard by upon the shore."

Fairly within a sheltering bay
 Our breasting bark had borne its way,
 And then, the favoring harbor won,
 The boatman thus his theme began.

RIME OF THE VOYAGEUR.

'Tis midnight over land and lake,
 And by the tempest's cry,
 There's tumult in the air awake,
 And terror in the sky !

The clouds are drifting wild abreast,
 And far, with swollen sail,—
 The dun clouds from the bleak nor'west,
 Sped by the rushing gale.

'Tis morn : the blast maintains its wrath,
 But frownless opes the day,
 And mounting high on glittering path,
 Ascends the dawning ray.

"Throw wide the door ! let in the sun !
 There needs no thrift of light,
 To bar the beams that waste and run,
 And starve the famished sight !

"It is enough to bear the pang,
That wrings the frame so sore,
Of hunger's rankling venom-fang—
Too much to make it more.

"Let in the light! let in the light!
And go, ANGELICA,—
A sail can ride through storm and night,
Perchance—go look, I pray."

The hutman said, and feebly leant
Upon his wasted arm,
And watched the waves that sped and spent,
And heard their hoarse alarm.

The winter cold, un pityingly,
Had dealt with cruel hand;
Its icy armor girt the sea,
Its snows o'erlaid the land.

Alone upon that island rude,
Long months of weary tide,
Had dwelt and loved, through ill and good,
Carl and his Indian bride.

Ill fared they in the fruitless waste,
For as the dull time wore,
Perished the guarded crust at last,
That formed their final store.

Then famine came!—Stranger pray God,
So thou may'st never know
The pains that gnaw—consume—corrode—
That brought that strong man low.

Inured to want, her threatening lot
The forest-wife withstood,
While pithless fare in misery sought,
Supplied a scanty food.

And day by day the hours rolled on,
And shrivelled, shrunk and wan,
A gaunt and ghastly Skeleton
There lay the grieved hutman.

"Speak wife; what hope doth morning bring?—
Say'st thou a sail!—a sail!"

"— It was a sea-gull's flashing wing,
That darted thwart the gale!"

"Stay, heard'st thou not high o'er the jar
Of waves that shrilly cry?"

"— An eagle's scream echoed afar,
That swept careering by!"

"The bark! the bark!—its creaking mast—
The dashing of its prow
I heard, as bounding free and fast—
Hark! hark! I hear it now!

"It is the brave crew's mingled shout,
And gallantly 'tis sped;—
Haste, fling the tattered signal out!—
Bread, holy Virgin, bread!

"Was it a treason of the brain?
Hath sense so learned to err?
I pause to meet the sound again,
And now there's none astir.

"It must be so!—Cease. cease my heart,
Lie still within thy cell!
Now light, and love, and hope depart,
Now life, my life, farewell.

"Farewell!—it was *their* parting word,
And, oh, it grieved me sore,
That home-adieu, the last I heard
When parting from the door.

"My father! did thy soul fore-fear
Aught boding else than well,
As on my palm in thine, a tear,
What time thou blest me, fell?

"Sister! a dimness palls my brow,
My pulse runs strangely wild,—
Come, throw thine arms around me now;
God bless thee, gentle child.

"Say, hang the ripe fruits, Ellie, mine,
Upon the garden tree?—
The purple clusters on the vine?—
And are they not for me?

"But now my weary head needs rest :
 Mother!—how fades the light!—
 Here, let me dream upon thy breast,
 And so—good night—good night!"

"A sail! a sail! ho, Carl, awake!
 Lo, 'tis no treacherous guile;
 It glides swift bounding o'er the lake,
 It steereth for our isle!"

"Arouse! arouse!"—aye when the blast
 Of judgment-time is sped!
 Then shall the sleeper wake at last—
 Christ shield him—Carl is dead!

* * * *

"How say'st thou, stranger?"—urge thine oar,
 Good *Voyageur*, and prate no more.
 To-night my dreams shall thither roam—
 To-morrow guide our bark for home!

Pittsburg, February, 1850.

R. P. N.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

[The following article forms the *Introduction* to an unpublished work, entitled "The History of the German Reformed Church in its origin and Progress," by the late Rev. Dr. LEWIS MAYER. It is generally known that this distinguished and excellent man had devoted himself, particularly after his retirement from the place so long honorably occupied by him in the Theological Seminary of the G. R. Church, to the task of preparing such a work, with reference especially to the rise and progress and present state of the Reformed division of the German Church in America. The feeble character of his health, added to the difficulties of the undertaking itself, led to much interruption and delay in its execution; and we are sorry to find now, since his decease, that the work as a whole is too incomplete altogether to be given to the world in a printed form. A part of it however, it is believed may yet appear in this way; being of sufficient interest and importance to justify its publication in such separate form, as well as in a state of proper preparation for the press under the author's own hand.]

The title Reformed Church, in its most comprehensive sense, designates all those professing Christians, who, embracing the

general system of doctrine which was taught by the Reformers, have rejected Luther's theory of a corporeal presence of Christ in the elements of the Lord's supper, and hold, in this particular, the belief of Zwingli, or that of Calvin. These christians constitute several distinct communities, each of which has its particular bond of union and differs from every other in some peculiarities which are sometimes of no little importance. They agree in few things about which they differ from Luther and his followers, except in their view of the Lord's supper. These communities are therefore so many distinct churches, and instead of calling them the Reformed Church, we must call them the Reformed Churches.

The title *Reformed*, was first assumed, in France, by those who separated from the Romish communion, and was adopted from them by their brethren in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, &c. In England it is used to denote all the churches which have embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and thus includes the Lutheran. On the continent it is the distinctive title of those Protestant communities which are not Lutheran, exclusive of Socinians and Anabaptists.

The French Protestants, were by their adversaries called Huguenots. The derivation of this term is somewhat uncertain. It is, however, very probable that it originated in a corrupt French pronunciation of the German word *Eidgenoss*, softened into *Eidgenott*, and then corrupted into *Huguenot*. The word *Eidgenoss*, in its plural *Eidgenossen* signifying *confederates*, or rather *partakers of the oath*, was originally the designation of the thirty-three Swiss confederates, who, in the night of the seventh of November 1307, bound themselves by a solemn oath to defend the liberties of their country against the Emperor ALBERT I. It became subsequently the distinctive title of the confederated Cantons which were parties to a perpetual league for the common defence and safety, and, in common parlance, was used to denote the people of those Cantons individually.

In *Germany* the Reformed were denominated, by their opponents *Zwinglians* and *Calvinists*, and in derision *Sacramentarians*. English writers speak of the two principal Protestant denominations on the continent as the Lutheran church and the Calvinistic church. This, however, is an erroneous distinction. The Reformed churches on the continent are not all Calvinistic. In some parts of *Germany* they never received Calvin's doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation; and the writer is not aware that it is, at this time, made a term of communion anywhere in the Reformed church of that country. This doctrine,

which constitutes the principal feature of the system to which name *Calvinism* is given, was taught in the Christian church long before Calvin, has always had adherents who, were not in connection with the Reformed church, and was held by Luther Melancthon, &c., themselves. The term *Zwinglians* is equally inappropriate. Zwingli held some opinions, both in doctrine and in church government, which were at no time generally received in the Reformed church, and in some of which he had few followers even in his own country.

As members of the Reformed church we are not pledged to receive and defend the system either of Calvin, or of Zwingli, or of any other man, except so far as it is in accordance with the Holy Scriptures. We acknowledge no master on earth; one is our master, even Christ. To his authority we submit with humble and cheerful acquiescence; we set at his feet in the character of learners, and receive his instructions as the teaching of God. He only is the Lord of conscience, and only his decision can limit the right of private judgment, and the freedom of enquiry. The memory of those great men who were instrumental in restoring the light of truth and the blessings of religious liberty is justly held in high veneration, and their faults are forgotten in the grateful remembrance of the benefits which they have conferred; but we do not forget that they were fallible men, and that God never could design to liberate us from the domination of one earthly master that we might be subjected to that of another.

The principal divisions of the Reformed church are the Helvetic or Swiss Reformed, the German Reformed, the French Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, and the English Reformed. The Waldenses and the Bohemian brethren are of the Reformed persuasion; and there are also many Reformed churches in *Hungary, Poland, Transylvania*, and other countries of *Europe*. The Reformed churches of *Switzerland* and of *Germany* may be taken as one, and comprised under the general designation of German Reformed, inasmuch as they use the same language, and differ in nothing that is of importance.

The English Reformed Church is subdivided into the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and the Congregational or Independent, which have embraced different theories of church government. Dr. Mosheim, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, speaking of the state of the Reformed church in the eighteenth century, says, "The Church of *England* is now the chief and leading branch of that great community that goes under the denomination of the Reformed Church." He means the established church of *Eng-*

land, which is the Episcopal. This representation differs widely from the impressions which are common in this country. It is imagined here, that the two great English churches, the Episcopal and the Presbyterian, must correspond to the two great German churches, the Lutheran and the Reformed; and it is common to speak of the Episcopal church as the English Lutheran, and of the German Reformed as the German Presbyterian. This is an error which ought to be avoided. The Episcopal church, which disallows the ordination of all other churches that are not governed by bishops, and, so far as the rigid party in it are concerned, does not allow that they are christian churches at all, differs more from the Lutheran Church than the Lutheran differs from any other of the Reformed churches. Though the Presbyterian Church and the German Reformed are both members of the same family, they are not one and the same member, any more than is the Episcopal or the Congregational. The difference of language is not the only difference, nor the most important one, subsisting between them. The German Reformed Church is governed by Elders and Deacons,¹ both of which are elected for limited periods; the Presbyterian Church is governed by Elders only, and these are chosen and ordained for life. The Reformed Church observes the festivals of Christmas, Good-Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Whitesuntide, in commemoration of the birth, the passion, the resurrection, and the ascension of Christ, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles; the Presbyterian rejects all holy-days except the Lord's day, on the ground that all others are of human appointment, and thus disallows the principle which other Christians hold, that the Church itself may set apart sacred seasons for the purpose of particularly commemorating the great leading facts of the Christian history, and contemplating the manifestations which they give of the riches of divine grace in our redemption. The German Reformed Church, like the Lutheran, considers the Lord's day a sacred season set apart for the performance of the ordinary public worship of God, and deriving all its sacredness from the service to which it is appointed; the Presbyterian regards the day as intrinsically holy. Presbyterians consider it the Sabbath enjoined by the fourth commandment, but modified by our Lord as to the day, and the penalty of its violation, and derive its sanctity from the fact that the seventh day is the day of God's resting from all his work. The

¹ In Switzerland it has neither lay-elders nor deacons.

Reformed Church admits the use of a liturgy in the worship of God and the administration of the sacraments; the Presbyterian rejects all set forms in its sacred ministrations as inconsistent with the spirituality and the freedom of Christian worship. The Presbyterian Church is strictly Calvinistic in her creed, and pronounces Arminianism, and all approaches to it, heresy, which it refuses to tolerate in its communion; the German Reformed Church indulges greater liberty of conscience to her members, and cherishes equally the Calvinist and the Arminian in her bosom. There is, therefore, as much difference, and of as much importance, between the German Reformed Church and the Presbyterian Church, as there is between any two other Protestant churches, except, in some respects, the Episcopalian; and it is consequently a great mistake to imagine that the languages which they use constitute all the difference between them.

The terms Episcopalian, or Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Congregational, have respect to the form of Church government in the several Churches to which these designations are respectively given. *Episcopal*, from the Greek *Episcopos*, a bishop, denotes a government of the Church by bishops, in the modern sense of this title. In this sense the bishop is the head of a diocese, and has under his jurisdiction two other orders of inferior clergy, namely, the order of priests, and, below this, the order of deacons. Each of these orders has its appropriate functions, and all are subject to the bishop's directions. *Presbyterian*, from the Greek *Presbyteros*, an elder, designates a government of the Church by elders. There are preaching elders or ministers of the word, and ruling elders. They constitute the several judicatories by which the Church is governed, which are essentially the Session and the Presbytery. The Session consists of the minister and the elders of a particular congregation. It manages the internal concerns of the congregation; but an appeal may be taken from its decision to the Presbytery. A Presbytery is composed of the minister and an elder from each of the congregations within certain bounds. It administers the external relation of the congregations within its bounds, and has an appellate jurisdiction in matters of internal interest. A Synod is an assemblage of several Presbyteries. The General Assembly is a delegated body composed of the representatives of all the Presbyteries, and deriving all its authority from them. An appeal can be taken from the Presbytery to the Synod, and from the Synod to the General Assembly, which is the court of final judicature: but neither the Synod nor the Assembly is essential to Presbyterianism. Congregational denotes a form of government which considers each particular congregation a perfect and independent commu-

nity within itself. "Every Christian society formed upon the congregational plan is strictly independent of every other religious society." It transacts all its own affairs, decides every question without appeal, and acknowledges no binding authority in the decisions of any number of congregations acting by delegates in an associated capacity.

The German Reformed Church differs from all these. She is essentially Presbyterian in her church government, as she holds the principle of the purity of all ordained ministers; but the form of her government is not in all respects the same as that of the Presbyterian Church; neither do her judicatories possess the same coercive power. The Dutch Reformed Church is, in this respect, more like the Presbyterian; the German Reformed more like the Lutheran.

"The nature and constitution of the Reformed Church," says Dr. Mosheim, "which was formerly denominated by its adversaries after its founders Zwingli and Calvin, is entirely different from all other ecclesiastical communities. Every other christian church has some common centre of union, and its members are connected together by some common bond of doctrine and discipline. But this is far from being the case of the Reformed Church, whose several branches are neither united by the same system of doctrine, nor by the same mode of worship, nor yet by the same form of government. It is farther to be observed that this church does not require from its ministers either uniformity in their private sentiments, or in their public doctrine, but permits them to explain in different ways several doctrines of no small moment, provided that the great and fundamental principles of Christianity, and the practical precepts of that divine religion, be maintained in their original purity. This great community, therefore, may be properly considered as an ecclesiastical body composed of several churches, that vary, more or less from each other in their form and constitution; but which are preserved, however, from anarchy and schisms, by a general spirit of equity and toleration, that runs through the whole system, and renders variety of opinion consistent with fraternal union."

"This indeed," the same author continues, "was not the original state and constitution of the Reformed Church, but was the result of a certain combination of events and circumstances, that threw it, by a sort of necessity, into this ambiguous form. The doctors of *Switzerland*, from whom it derived its origin, and Calvin, who was one of its principal founders, employed all their credit, and exerted their most vigorous efforts, in order to reduce all the churches, which embraced their sentiments, under one

rule of faith, and the same form of ecclesiastical government. And although they considered the Lutherans as their brethren, yet they shewed no marks of indulgence to those who openly favored the opinions of Luther, concerning the *Eucharist*, the *Person of Christ*, *Predestination*, and other matters that were connected with these doctrines; nor would they permit the other Protestant churches, that embraced their communion, to deviate from their example in this respect. A new scene, however, which was exhibited in *Britain*, contributed much to enlarge this narrow and contracted system of Church communion. For when the violent contest concerning the form of ecclesiastical government, and the nature and number of those rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted into the public worship, arose between the abettors of Episcopacy and the Puritans, it was judged necessary to extend the borders of the Reformed Church, and rank in the class of its true members, even those who departed, in some respects, from the ecclesiastical polity and doctrines established at Geneva. This spirit of toleration and indulgence grew still more forbearing and comprehensive after the famous Synod of *Dort*. For though the sentiments and doctrines of the Arminians were condemned in that numerous assembly, yet they gained ground privately, and insinuated themselves into the minds of many. The church of *England*, under the reign of Charles I. publicly renounced the opinions of Calvin relating to the divine decrees, and made several attempts to model its doctrine and institutions after the laws, tenets, and customs, that were observed by the primitive Christians. On the other hand, several Lutheran congregations in *Germany* entertained a strong propensity to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of *Geneva*; though they were restrained from declaring themselves fully and openly on this head, by their apprehensions of forfeiting the privileges they derived from their adherence to the confession of *Augsburg*. The French refugees also, who had long been accustomed to a moderate way of thinking in religious matters, and whose national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being dispersed abroad in all parts of the Protestant world, rendered themselves so agreeable by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a kind of emulation in favor of religious liberty. All these circumstances, accompanied with others whose influence was less palpable, though equally real, instilled, by degrees, such a spirit of levity and forbearance into the minds of Protestants, that at this day, all Christians, if we except Roman Catholics, Socinians, Quakers, and Anabaptists, may claim a place among the members of the Re-

formed Church. It is true, great reluctance was discovered by many against this comprehensive scheme of church-communion; and, even in the times in which we live, the ancient and less charitable manner of proceeding hath several patrons, who would be glad to see the doctrines and institutions of Calvin universally adopted, and rigorously observed. The number, however, of these rigid doctors is not very great, nor is their influence considerable. And it may be affirmed with truth that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a narrow compass the fundamental doctrines of Christianity on the belief of which salvation depends, exercise forbearance and fraternal charity towards those who explain certain doctrines in a manner peculiar to themselves, and desire to see the enclosure (if I may use that expression) of the Reformed Church rendered as large and comprehensive as possible."

What this learned writer says of the Reformed Church collectively is not equally applicable to all the several communities that are comprehended in it, nor of all the same communities in every period of their existence. These different communities have but little connection with one another; and their agreement on those points in which they differ from the Roman Catholics, or from the Lutherans, cannot prevent their disagreement about some other things which, in their estimation, are of equal or of greater moment: neither can it wholly prevent the indulgence of those feelings which controversy among themselves has a tendency to excite and to nourish. But upon the whole, and as applied to the Reformed church in general, the author's remarks are just; and as far as they are just, they do it great honor. It is only to be regretted that they are not applicable without modification, or without exception: for nothing certainly can be more in unison with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the mind of its divine author, than that, as we cannot all agree about every shade of doctrine and of worship, we should agree to differ without an interruption of fraternal harmony and of christian love.

The remark of Dr. Mosheim, That the Reformed shewed no marks of indulgence to those who openly favored the sentiments of Luther concerning the eucharist, the person of Christ, or predestination, implies that Luther did not hold the doctrine of predestination, and that it was exclusively a doctrine of the Reformed Church. This is incorrect. Luther held the doctrine of predestination as rigidly as Zwingli or Calvin. There was no controversy on this point between the reformers, nor between the

two churches for some time after Luther's death. In departing from this doctrine, the Lutheran Church became a follower, not of Luther, but of Melancthon, who himself had been, for many years, a strenuous predestinarian.

Another remark, That the Church of *England*, under the reign of Charles I. publicly renounced the doctrine of Calvin concerning the divine decrees, is also inaccurate. "Though many members of that church, with Archbishop Laud at their head, taught the doctrines of Arminius, and propagated them in that reign, there was no public act of the Church by which it renounced the sentiments of Calvin, and adopted those of Arminius."¹

A complete separate history of the Reformed Church has not yet been published. It was undertaken by Abraham Schultet of the Palatinate, and brought down as far as his own time, in his *Annales Evangelü Renovati*, the greater part of which is lost. Among the works which have appeared in this department of literature are the following:

Histoire de la religion des Eglises Reformees depuis Jesus Christ jusqu'a present, par Mons J. Basuage, 2 vol. 4 to. 1721. "This work is not a regular history of the Reformed church, but is designed only to shew that the peculiar doctrines of this church were not new, but were taught and professed in the earliest ages of christianity."

Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Reformees au Royaume de France, depuis l'an 1521 jusqu'en l'annee 1563. 3 vol. 8 vo. By Theodore Beza, the successor of Calvin at Geneva, and N. Galassius.

Histoire de l'edit de Nantes. By L. Benoist, preacher of the Walloon church in Delft. 5 vol. 4 to. This work embraces the whole Reformed church from 1520 to 1586.

J. H. Hottinger Historia Ecclesiastica. Part IX—J. J. Hottinger's Helvetesche Kirchen-Geschichte 3 vol. 4 to Theil. III, which brings the history of the Swiss church to the year 1700. Abraham Ruchat Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse, 6 vol. 12 mo.

Neuere Helvetische Kirchen-geschichte von der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit; von Ludwig Wirz; fortgesetzt von Melchior Kirchhofer 2 vol. 8 vo. 1816-19. This is the fourth and fifth volume of a larger work entitled Helvetische Kirchen-geschichte, von Lud. Wirz, in 5 vol. The history is brought only to the year 1522.

¹ Maclaine's Mosheim.

Ursprung, Gang, and Folgen der von Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich bewirkten glaubens—Verbesserung und Reformation. Von Solomon Hess. Zurich, 1819. 4 to.

Schichsole der Protestanten in Frankreich, von —Rambach, 2 vol. 8 vo. Halle, 1795.

Historische Nachricht von dem erstem Anfang der Evangelish Reformirten Kirche in Brandenburg und Preusseu, &c. Von D. H. Hering.

Besides these many other works containing portions of the history of the Reformed Church in Great Britain, the Netherlands, and the several German States, have been published. A brief general account of the Reformed church is contained in the several works of general ecclesiastical history which have been written ; and many notices of it are interspersed in the civil history of the several countries in which it is professed.